DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 077 000 CS 200 465

AUTHOR	Squire, James R., Ed.
TITLE	A Common Purpose: The Teaching of English in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States. A Report of the International Conference on the Teaching of English (Boston, Massachusetts, November 24-28, 1965).
INSTITUTION	National Council of Teachers of English, Champaign, Ill.
SPONS AGENCY	National Association for the Teaching of English (England).
PUB DATE	66
NOTE	228p.
AVAILABLE FROM	National Council of Teachers of English, 1111 Kenyon Road, Urbana, Illinois 61801 (Stock No. 01107, $3.30 non-member, $3.00 member)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$9.87
DESCRIPTORS	Composition (Literary); Educational Research; Elementary Education; *English Instruction; *English Programs; Inservice Teacher Education; Language Instruction; Linguistics; Literature; Oral English; Secondary Education; Student Evaluation; *Student Testing; *Teacher Associations; *Teacher Education; Testing Programs
IDENTIFIERS	Canada; *Great Britain

ABSTRACT

The 35 papers presented at the 1965 International Conference on the Teaching of English, sponsored by the National Council of Teachers of English of the United States and the National Association for the Teaching of English of Great Britain, are collected in this volume. In the first section, the aims and purposes of teaching English in the United States and Great Britain are discussed, and methods for realizing common goals are suggested. The second and largest section of the volume contains papers on mutual problems in the teaching of language, literature, and composition. Approaches to teaching English in the elementary grades in the next section, the value and accuracy of literature examinations in Britain, the use of external examinations in U. S. public schools, and the impact of examinations on American independence schools are evaluated. Section five deals with higher education, teacher education, and research; and the last section surveys the growth and organization of associations of English teachers, as well as discussing their cooperation and coordination. Sixteen pages of selected references on the teaching of English in Anglo-American countries are appended. (This document previously announced as ED 023 680.) (LH)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 077000

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A COMMON PURPOSE

The Teaching of English in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States

Edited by JAMES R. SQUIRE

A report of the
INTERNATIONAL CONFERENCE ON THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH
Cosponsored by the
NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH and the
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION FOR THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH
Boston, Massachusetts • November 24-28, 1965

NATIONAL COUNCIL OF TEACHERS OF ENGLISH
508 South Sixth Street • Champaign, Illinois 61820

NCTE Committee on Publications

James R. Squire, NCTE Executive Secretary, *Chairman*
Glenn Leggett, Grinnell College
Virginia M. Reid, Oakland Public Schools, California
Frank E. Ross, Eastern Michigan University
Enid M. Olson, NCTE Director of Publications

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
National Council
of Teachers of English
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

Copyright 1966
National Council of Teachers of English
508 South Sixth Street
Champaign, Illinois 61820

CONTENTS

Introduction v
Participants ix

I. THE ENDS OF ENGLISH INSTRUCTION

Aims and Purposes of Teaching English in Britain
Denys Thompson 3
Aims and Purposes of Teaching English in the United States
Albert H. Marckwardt 11
Suggested Methods for Realizing Our Common Goals
Marion Edman 17
Discussion on the Ends of English Instruction 23

II. LITERATURE, LANGUAGE, AND COMPOSITION

Literature Teaching in English Schools
George Allen 29
Teaching Literature in American High Schools
Elizabeth Bennett 39
Discussion on the Teaching of Literature 45
Types of Deviance in English Sentences
Randolph Quirk 46
Sentence Deviance in Linguistics and Language Teaching
Charles A. Ferguson 61
Language Teaching in Canadian Secondary Schools
Philip G. Penner 70
Language Teaching in American Elementary Schools
Ruth G. Strickland 77
Discussion on the Teaching of Language 81
Teaching Oral and Written English in Nonselective
Secondary Schools—*William T. Spouge* 83
Teaching Oral and Written English in the United States
J. N. Hook 95
Teaching Writing in Canada
Earl W. Buxton 100
Discussion on the Teaching of Writing 107

III. ENGLISH AND THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

English and the Primary School
Sybil Marshall 111
Language Centered Programs in the United States
Miriam E. Wilt 123
English in Canadian Primary Schools
H. M. Nason 127
Discussion on Teaching English in the Elementary School 132

IV. THE USES AND EFFECTS OF EXAMINATIONS

Examinations and Literature
Frank Whitehead 137

The Use of External Tests in Public Schools in the United States
Paul B. Diederich 146

The Impact of Examinations on American Independent Schools
William H. Brown 153

Discussion on the Use of Examinations 157

V. HIGHER EDUCATION, TEACHER EDUCATION, AND RESEARCH

The Scope of English Studies in British Universities
Richard Hoggart 161

Remarks Inspired by Professor Hoggart
George L. Anderson 170

English and the Training of Teachers
Andrew Wilkinson 178

Teacher Education in America
Henry C. Meckel 189

Governmental Interest in Research in English
Francis A. J. Ianni 194

Teacher Education in Canada
James A. MacNeill 200

Discussion on Teacher Education 205

VI. THE GROWTH AND ORGANIZATION, THE COOPERATION AND COORDINATION OF ENGLISH ASSOCIATIONS

The Organization of Teachers of English in Great Britain
Esmor Jones 209

Professional English Associations in Canada
Merron Chorny 215

Professional English Associations in the United States
Ralph C. Staiger 219

Discussion on the Problems and Possibilities of International Cooperation 221

VII. SELECTED REFERENCES ON THE TEACHING OF ENGLISH IN ANGLO-AMERICAN COUNTRIES

United States 227

Great Britain 233

Canada 241

Introduction

Like any important professional event, the International Conference on the Teaching of English held in Boston on November 24-28, 1965, had both antecedents and consequences. Sponsored by the National Council of Teachers of English of the United States and the National Association for the Teaching of English of Great Britain, it was the first such conference to be organized. It involved some forty Englishmen, Americans, and Canadians interested in instruction in English from the primary school through graduate school. Its purpose was to compare and contrast the ends and means of instruction in our common language.

The Boston meeting was an almost inevitable consequence of the contacts and professional relationships which had been developing for several years among leaders of English teaching in the several countries. For almost a decade, the NCTE has sponsored summer study tours for its members in Great Britain, tours which provide opportunity for teachers to study the teaching of English at Oxford or York and to meet some English teachers. During this period, also, a series of international conferences sponsored by national agencies in the United States and Britain concerned themselves with teaching English as a second language. Although the teaching and learning of the mother tongue received little attention, such meetings of linguists from several countries prompted a realization of our common purpose. Thus, in 1957, Harold B. Allen proposed a conference like the one actually held in Boston; his suggestion, perhaps slightly premature, prompted the Executive Committee of NCTE to explore the possibilities of organizing an international association to serve the interests of teachers of English in all countries. The organization of an association itself was not attempted, but the interest engendered was sufficient to encourage such NCTE leaders as David H. Russell, J. N. Hook, and Ruth G. Strickland to visit English schools for the purpose of studying English in England. And with improved air travel regular transatlantic flights became possible, and British scholars and teachers visited throughout the United States and Canada with increasing frequency. Indeed, the month long tour of Her Majesty's Inspector, George Allen, to the Project English centers of American universities during the spring of 1965 provided as important a prelude to the Boston meeting as did participation of NCTE's Muriel Crosby in the 1965 NATE convention in London.

The growing communication between teachers and scholars has been paralleled by an increase in professional activity in all three countries. Membership in the National Council of Teachers of English has tripled during the past decade. English associations have been formed in the provinces of Canada, and these provincial councils—lacking at present a national Canadian association in English—have affiliated themselves with NCTE and participate strongly in annual meetings of the Council. In Great Britain, the National Association for the Teaching of English was organized in 1963 to provide a national voice for many existing local and regional groups. When Boris Ford, 1964 president of NATE, attended the 54th convention of NCTE, he provided the opportunity to plan in detail an invitational conference involving representatives from all educational levels.

The papers prepared for the conference were read publicly as well as discussed in the invitational meetings. Time did not permit as thorough investigation of all topics as conferees might have wished, but agreements as well as differences clearly emerged. The concern of the British over the impact of external examinations is as characteristic of English education in Britain as is the present American emphasis on covering subject matter. Canadians variously report their schools to represent a blending of British and American systems of education, but whether they inherit the best or worst characteristics is far from clear even to Canadian leaders. Differences, then, exist in the systems of education as well as differences in the content and method of instruction. Yet the conferees were not always in disagreement. For example, national origin seems less important in determining a point of view toward English in primary education than basic interest in children, as the American and Canadian agreement with Sybil Marshall's views makes apparent. The discovery of unexpected support as well as unexpected problems among the leadership of another educational system was one of the most salutary aspects of the Boston meeting.

The international conference at Boston represents a beginning, not an end. There the conferees themselves recommended a series of steps to strengthen communication among teachers in the three countries and laid tentative plans for other international meetings. Even as this report on the Boston meetings is being prepared, the NCTE and the NATE join with the Modern Language Association of America to cosponsor a seminar of scholars and teachers at Dartmouth College during the fall of 1966 in order to consider further the basic problems in teaching and learning English.

Teachers in Great Britain, Canada, and the United States share a common language and a common literature, a common purpose and many common problems. Has not the time come in English teaching when the resources of our three countries, the discoveries of our most productive scholars, and the experiences of our most insightful teachers should be shared for the greater good of children and young people who are learning English as a native language throughout the world?

J.R.S.

Urbana, Illinois
April, 1966

Participants in the International Conference

Cochairman: JAMES R. SQUIRE, Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English; Professor of English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

Cochairman: ROBERT F. HOGAN, Associate Executive Secretary, National Council of Teachers of English

Local Chairman: M. AGNELLA GUNN, Professor of Education, University of Connecticut, Storrs, Connecticut

Recorder: TIM E. MORELAND, JR., Staff Assistant, National Council of Teachers of English

Editorial Assistant: JONATHAN CORBIN, Staff Assistant, National Council of Teachers of English

Participants:

GEORGE CAMERON ALLEN, Staff Inspector for English, Curzon State House, London, England

GEORGE L. ANDERSON, Associate Executive Secretary, Modern Language Association of America; Associate Professor of English, New York University, New York, New York

RONALD J. BAKER, Head, Department of English, Simon Fraser University, Vancouver, British Columbia

ELIZABETH BENNETT, Berkeley High School, Berkeley, California

WILLIAM H. BROWN, Chairman, Department of English, Phillips Academy, Andover, Massachusetts

EARL W. BUXTON, Professor of English Education, University of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta

FREDERIC G. CASSIDY, Professor of English, University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

MERRON CHORNY, Assistant Professor of English Education, University of Alberta, Calgary, Alberta

RICHARD CORBIN, President, National Council of Teachers of English; Chairman, Department of English, Hunter College High School, New York, New York

MURIEL CROSBY, First Vice President, National Council of Teachers of English; Assistant Superintendent for Educational Programs, Wilmington, Delaware

LEONARD F. DEAN, Chairman, Department of English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

PAUL B. DIEDERICH, Director of Research in English, Educational Testing Service, Princeton, New Jersey

MARION EDMAN, Professor of Education, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

CHARLES A. FERGUSON, Director, Center for Applied Linguistics, Washington, D. C.

JOHN H. FISHER, Executive Secretary, Modern Language Association of America; Professor of English, New York University, New York, New York

WINSTON HEALY, JR., Department of English, Punahou Academy, Honolulu, Hawaii

RICHARD HOGGART, Director, Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, England

J. N. HOOK, Professor of English, University of Illinois, Urbana, Illinois

FRANCIS A. J. IANNI, Acting Associate Commissioner of the Bureau of Research, U. S. Office of Education, Washington, D. C.

ESMOR JONES, Honorary Secretary, National Association for the Teaching of English; Department of English, Ashmead School, Reading, England

LEWIS LEARY, Professor of English, Columbia Unversity, New York, New York; Consultant in English, U. S. Office of Education

JAMES A. MAC NEILL, Instructor in English Education, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Saskatchewan

ALBERT H. MARCKWARDT, Professor of English and Linguistics, Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey

SYBIL MARSHALL, Lecturer in Primary Education, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, England

HENRY C. MECKEL, Professor of English and Education, San Jose State College, San Jose, California

JOSEPH MERSAND, Chairman, Department of English, Jamaica High School, New York, New York

HAROLD M. NASON, Director of Education, Nova Scotia Department of Education, Halifax, Nova Scotia

PHILIP G. PENNER, Associate Professor of English Education, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia

JOHN F. POVEY, Professor of English, University of California at Los Angeles, Los Angeles, California

RANDOLPH QUIRK, Professor of English Language, University College, London, England

WILLIAM T. SPOUGE, Assistant Secretary, National Association for the Teaching of English; Chairman, Department of English, Mount Pleasant County Secondary School, York, England

RALPH C. STAIGER, Executive Secretary, International Reading Association; Professor of Education, University of Delaware, Newark, Delaware

RUTH G. STRICKLAND, Research Professor of Education, Indiana University, Bloomington, Indiana

DENYS THOMPSON, Editor, *The Use of English;* Vice Chairman, National Association for the Teaching of English, Yeovil, England

HOWARD P. VINCENT, Professor of English, Kent State University, Kent, Ohio

FRANK WHITEHEAD, Chairman, National Association for the Teaching of English; Senior Lecturer in English and Education, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, England

ANDREW WILKINSON, Lecturer in Education, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, England

MIRIAM E. WILT, Professor of Early Childhood and Elementary Education, Temple University, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

I

The Ends of English Instruction

Aims and Purposes of Teaching English in Britain

Denys Thompson

Between the scholars, critics, and university teachers of the United States and Britain there is an effective exchange; the lines of communication are open; each side is aware of what is going on elsewhere. But American and British teachers in school, the people who lay the foundation for the superstructure of criticism and scholarship, have virtually no contact with each other apart from a few exchange visits. Therefore, many of us in Britain who have hoped that channels might be opened are grateful for this opportunity to meet and present our papers. We should not expect too much from it; there are differences in practice on both sides all along the line in schools. But before the gap can be bridged we must measure its depth and width. After that the really fruitful discussion, I hope, will follow at the Dartmouth seminar in August 1966.

The aims of teaching the mother tongue in Britain are by no means clear and generally accepted. There could in fact be almost as many aims as there are teachers of the subject. For this confusion the English tradition of decentralization is in part responsible. Neither our local education authorities nor our governmental Department of Education prescribes syllabuses or books from the center, for in theory the head of each school is charged with planning the curriculum, and the teachers for drawing up the syllabus. In practice the freedom is very much restricted by the demands of examinations and vocational training. This decentralization has advantages as well as disadvantages. It allows to the good teacher and to those who would chafe under an imposed syllabus a scope for enterprise and experiment, so that, for example, teachers who dislike any form of textbook need use none at all. It means also that ideas can spread quickly and good books circulate freely—novels by

D. H. Lawrence have been examination set books for some years.

Since no one can speak for all teachers of English, I shall try to put a case that would be accepted by the more thoughtful of them—by those who habitually look outside and beyond the classroom and examination hall. They give the spearhead of the NATE what force and sharpness it may have. They start teaching with the general aims of fitting their pupils to earn a living and take their place in society and, secondly, of giving them a good chance to develop as human beings. When they look out of the classroom, they are bound to have some doubts. Can they conscientiously prepare their pupils to take the kind of place offered by the society they see? Is there not a possible contradiction between the two general aims? Is it not likely that as people are better fitted to earn a living, the less likely they are to be developed human beings? So many of the trends in our society seem to be of a dehumanizing nature, even if we have not reached what Henry James called "the awful doom of general dishumanization." Many modern ways of earning a living and spending leisure do not call for and do not foster specifically human qualities; in the job we are geared with the production of goods for consumption, and outside it we desperately try to fulfill our function as consumers. (The trend is agreeably satirized in E. K. Pohl's "The Midas Plague.") Incidentally the view of the society suggested here, which stems from Wordsworth and Arnold, continued vigorously by Lawrence, Leavis and others, has been given deeper penetration and sharper focus by a long line of Americans from Veblen, the Lynds, and Stuart Chase, up to Galbraith, Riesman, and Boorstin.

To such developments our subject, English, is directly and by its nature opposed. For instance, the teacher of English is concerned with words; and he notes it is through words that one of the forces eroding and displacing education—advertising—attacks the individual. When a copywriter says of a soap that it is "Fresh as an English rose on a dewy summer's morn," he is exploring the associations of words, enriched by use in literature; he is debasing the currency of our language. The teacher will hope to enlighten his pupils to such devices—it is easy enough. In doing so, he will not be straying from his main task, the teaching of literature. In debunking one of the tricks of advertising he will be showing how poetry works; even teachers not particularly interested in advertising may find it the best way for the modern child to approach an understanding of poetry. The poet and the copywriter use the same means—releasing the emotional charge of words, only to rather different ends. For example, Burns used the word we have already cited, when he wrote:

> O my luve's like a red, red rose
> That's newly sprung in June . . .

It is the poets, especially from Chaucer onwards, who have built up the emotional capital of words like "love" and "beauty," which are a capital now being exploited by entertainers and admen.

Other mass media forces affecting our teaching actually restrict the use of words by children. Reading is pushed into the background by television and printed matter that limit language to what can be stuffed into the balloons billowing out from the characters in cartoons. Carried far enough, the effects would produce a world of morons, since our development as human beings depends on language, for most people in the form of speech. A healthy baby will grow into a mental defective if it has not the opportunity of hearing speech and thus learning to speak. Without the emotional and intellectual growth that language makes possible, we are animals, thinking in pictures and feeling at the brute level. Anyone with experience of disadvantaged children in a poverty stricken environment knows very well that those from homes where there is little speech are unable to profit from what education and culture have to offer them. They cannot realize their human potential, for words, not being just an adjunct to living, are part of life itself. If a teacher can help children "to find the right words . . . to embody and communicate what they feel, not only should they understand their feelings better and deal with them more maturely, but the feelings themselves become . . . more refined and less self-centered."[1] And a neat and simple example comes from L. C. Knights—" . . . you *see* so much more of the forest when you know the names of the trees."[2]

Words are a part of living. The expression of an experience focuses that experience, crystallizes it, and enables us to come to terms with joy, suffering, or whatever it may be. (That is the importance of poetry.) Our emotional life is rich insofar as it can be expressed adequately in language, the language, which in Frank Whitehead's words, shapes the habits of mind and feeling which determine a man's capacity for living. The more effective the language, the fuller the living.

---

[1] Statement on English by the Department of Education (Knapp College, Yoevil, England).

[2] L. C. Knights, "The Place of English Literature in a Liberal Education," *The Use of English,* IV, 3 (Spring 1958), 157.

The most deeply effective form of language is literature, which many of us believe should be the core of English teaching at every level of education. In this view, virtually all English courses, including those designed for, say, engineering apprentices or those planned to help graduate scientists write their theses, should be geared to literature in some way or other. Without this contact, the teaching of mere communications is for both teacher and taught a dull and sterile affair. And even in reaching its limited aim, it may be slower and less effective just for lack of the life that flows from literature. Of course, I am using the term "literature" in an inclusive way, to cover a good range of quite humble work that may have no pretension to permanent value. Examples will vary almost from year to year, but these come to mind: for young children, Will James' *Smoky;* later on, Arthur Grimble and Gerald Durrell, and the better science fiction like G. R. Stewart's *Earth Abides.*

This view—that literature is the best route to good "communications" English—is not hypothetical. It is backed by research, the earliest note being sounded by Professor Boris Ford. When he conducted a survey of the relationship between vocational and nonvocational education, he found in examining the English work of technical students that "the most striking improvements are achieved when the teaching of English is not confined to its more utilitarian aspects."[3]

The case for literature in education is that it stands for humanity, at a time when the human values are not upheld, as they used to be, by religion and the home, or even by education itself as a whole. Among these values we must number imagination, as well as the obviously acceptable ones like sympathy, understanding, and tolerance. Literature stands for them, not by preaching or philosophizing or pointing to them from outside, but by presenting them concretely embodied, alive and working, in the characters and action of a play or novel, or in the experience of a poem. The gift of imagination is most striking in writers and scientists, but it is also badly needed everywhere today—in politicians, in administrators, and in the hosts of people whom we appoint to push us around. The problems of the day are human problems, requiring not so much technical expertise as insight into human beings and human relations. The arts generally, but literature above all, are the best way of stimulating and feeding the imagination; and it may be asserted that an education which does not try to develop a response to imaginative literature, including poetry, does not deserve the name of education.

---

[3] Boris Ford, *Liberal Education in a Technical Age* (London: Max Parrish, Ltd., 1955), p. 53.

Literature is not a substitute for religion. But inescapably literature provides a compass and helps to supply the sense of direction that used to derive from religious and traditional sanctions. The values I mentioned are not established or imposed by precept, but by a knowledge of how different kinds of people behave in the world today. The student of literature becomes more aware of the world he lives in and of the way it is drifting, as well as of people. (D. H. Lawrence's writing seems to be the perfect example of literature that prompts this twofold awareness.) Or he does not. He does not become more aware, if his reading sticks long in Enid Blyton and continues *via* comics to Micky Spillane and the James Bond books. No one claims that literature supplies solutions to world problems, to overpopulation and poverty, to race relations and the fallout. It does enable us to see into the heart of things, to grasp the underlying issues, and to check that proffered solutions are humanly satisfying and not just technically viable.

We have school programs and textbooks that discuss such issues as I have mentioned, but many children will not have the ability and maturity to get far in such discussions; their own personal problems and immediate difficulties may blot out the distant view. For this group, literature, which is freer and wider ranging and less trammeled than films and television, has enormous value. Teachers have noted how well-chosen fiction, some of it ephemeral, can help adolescents to resolve their difficulties and to understand more clearly themselves and the people they meet. As an English inspector of education noted, "Someone entering wholly, for once, into the feelings of others can . . . be helped to sense what it is like to be a colored man in a 'white supremacy' area, or a childless woman, or to encounter the death of someone very close." Peter Abrahams' *Tell Freedom* comes to mind as an example. Literature makes for growth.

Thus the contention is that literature assists the individual to acquire a sense of what matters and an understanding of himself and his environment. It also offers a technique for coping with that environment, in particular for repelling the attacks on and the invasion of personality that are features of our mass civilization. The ads that would reduce us to compulsive consumers, the politicians' wordspinning, the slanted language of the press, the pulp magazine—all these use language in a dehumanizing way. All would lose a good deal of their power if more people in our democracy had more of the sensitivity to words that comes from the study of literature.

It may be said that I have cast the teacher of English in the role of missionary, saving the souls of his probably unwilling pupils by the gospel of literature. I do not quite see it that way. All ages have needed survival kits of one sort or another—the skill of hunting in one, the invention of agriculture in another. In this age we have created an environment that is in some ways hostile to humanity, and in the jungle it is the arts, and chiefly literature, for which we need to provide a map and a compass. That is the contribution of our subject towards turning out better men and women.

All this is very fine, it may be objected, but what place is there in your scheme for instruction in writing, the planning of a composition or a letter, the attaining of a decent standard of correctness in the mechanics of English—in fact all the uses of the language that enable us, from clerks to scientists, to earn a living? Is the general standard of communication so high that you can afford to neglect it?

The answer to that last rhetorical question is "No." The general standard is deplorably low and badly needs raising. Nor do we disdain the need to cater for vocational ends. We differ from some people in the United States and in Britain over the best means of attaining those vocational ends and of raising the standard of communication. We in England are often very slow in changing and in realizing the need for change. Otherwise it might have dawned on us before that an elaborate examination structure of English tests, designed to assess a candidate's attainment in writing and understanding of his mother tongue and to encourage courses that will lead to that attainment, is an almost total failure. But the light has been seen at last; existing tests are being scrapped, and new ones evolved that will interfere little or not at all with the teaching of English in schools. The ends are agreed; the means are still being debated.

Let us take grammar, for instance. What grammar is useful, to whom, and when? The old prescriptive grammar is commonly dismissed as "the occupational disease of a scholar"; but can we be happy about any of the replacements or about any of the linguistic work as yet tried out in school? Are we convinced that they help a child to speak or write better, or leave him any the more able to read good literature or see through an advertisement? That is the crux.

Most of us would agree that composition can be taught up to a point, that there is a need for orderly arrangement, and so on; but of late the trend has been to let training in composition take second place to ensuring that pupils have something to write about that engages them and sets their pens going. Many teachers feel that if there is an individual response to fresh and lively material, the rest will follow.

And does that "rest will follow" include the mechanics of English spelling and punctuation? All over the English-speaking world an enormous amount of energy and tons of books have been and are being devoted to this end, but with quite disproportionately small results on the positive side, and with much loss of interest and zest. The mechanics of English can be learned, but it is doubtful if all of them can be taught. Mechanical accuracy will come with maturity, or it will not; and what the teacher does about it may make little difference. The writers of heavy textbooks that offer training in these skills neglect both the nature of language and the findings of psychology on how children learn. An example of such research records the results of an experiment that took place in Birmingham, England.[4] The experimenters tested and recorded the attainments in the mechanics of English of two groups of children. Then the experimental group was let loose in the library, given every encouragement and help to read, and required to do a good deal of writing. The children in that group were given no formal teaching. The control group was taught grammar, spelling, punctuation, sentence strucutre, and arrangement by conventional methods. At the end of the experimental period both groups were retested, and the experimental group which had had no teaching was found to be significantly better at most of the skills which the control group had been learning and practicing with a teacher.

Another inquiry with exciting results was recently conducted by a county education authority. Concerned at the enormous amount of money spent on the textbooks, often of a positively anti-education nature, the education officer called for reports and examples of written work from schools of all types. Several conclusions emerged, of which we shall mention two. First, the best writing was done in schools where little or no use was made of textbooks and conventional exercises in grammar, punctuation, and so on. Secondly, and this is a point on which research is needed, it seemed that good creative writing on topics that really engaged a child led to good "recording" or "reporting" writing of a more impersonal kind. By "recording" writing, I mean, for example, the kind that they need for writing up science experiments and geography notes. Both the Birmingham experiment and the West Yorkshire survey have far-reaching implications for the teaching of English, too far-reaching perhaps for the comfort of many teachers and the writers of textbooks. Perhaps this is why neither has yet had the wide attention that they deserve.

---

[4] W. C. Heath, "Library-Centred English: An Experiment," *NATE Bulletin,* Spring 1965.

My contention then is that English in education is one and indivisible; that no aspect of it can be profitably treated in isolation; and that literature as a means to enjoyment, growth, and understanding should be at the center of English teaching at every level. May I end with a quotation from a booklet that Ezra Pound wrote a third of a century ago; it is not the whole truth, but it forcefully presents one aspect of the truth:

> Has literature a function in the State? . . . It has . . . it has to do with the clarity of any and every thought and opinion. It has to do with maintaining the very cleanliness of the tools, the health of the very matter of thought itself. Save in the rare and very limited instances of invention in the plastic arts, or in mathematics, the individual cannot think or communicate his thought, the governor or legislator cannot act effectively or frame his laws, without words, and the solidity and validity of these words is in the care of the damned and despised literati. When their work goes rotten . . . by that I do not mean when they express indecorous thoughts . . . but when their very medium, the very essence of their work, the application of word to thing, goes rotten, i.e., become slushy and inexact, or excessive or bloated, the whole machinery of social and of individual thought and order goes to pot.[5]

---

[5] Ezra Pound, *How to Read* (London: Desmond Harmsworth, 1934), pp. 17-18.

Aims and Purposes of Teaching English in the United States

Albert H. Marckwardt

Over the past several years it has been my good fortune to observe the teaching of English in many parts of the world and to learn something of the educational and pedagogical premises upon which it proceeds, not only where it is taught as a foreign or second language but where it is the native language as well. Despite Denys Thompson's modest disclaimer, it is evident that he does speak on these matters for the teachers of English in Britain with admirable force and clarity. And just as an English colleague and I have previously maintained with respect to the British and American varieties of the English language, that the underlying unity far outweighs the diversity, the same conclusion would seem quite as neatly to fit the teaching of English in our respective countries. Consequently, I think a good deal may be expected from the dialogues between British and Americans which are scheduled to take place during this meeting.

We are told by Mr. Thompson that "The aims of teaching the mother tongue in Britain are by no means clear and generally accepted. There could, in fact, be almost as many aims as there are teachers of the subject." Had the aims of teaching the mother tongue in the United States been clear, the Basic Issues Conference of 1958 would never have been convened. And as far as multiplicity of aim is concerned, I can cite as an American instance the 1,537 social objectives of teaching English which were painstakingly catalogued by Dr. Charles S. Pendleton in his doctoral dissertation over forty years ago.[1]

Mr. Thompson sees the tradition of decentralization as mainly responsible for the confused situation in England. I am inclined to feel that we, in the United States, would be capable of our present state of confusion even if we had a federalized system, but the fact is that we think of ourselves as the prime exemplar of local control in education. Actually, there is decentralization in both countries, but of a somewhat different kind.

---

[1] Charles S. Pendleton, "The Social Objectives of School English" (Doctoral dissertation, George Peabody College for Teachers, 1924).

There are many other points in Mr. Thompson's presentation with which I can foresee little or no disagreement on the American side. Certainly most of us would insist with him that literature should be the core of English teaching at every level of education. As he does, we believe that literature stands for humanity at a time when human values are not upheld, or at the least we would observe that for many of our students the course in English provides their only contact with the humanities. I doubt that any one of us would take issue with his insistence that "an education which does not try to develop a response to imaginative literature, including poetry, does not deserve the name of education."[2]

We, too, sense the dangers to a democratic society by the manipulation of language in a milieu where the mass media are powerful. We agree in sensing that the current environment is in many ways hostile to humanity—or at least to the humanities—if a distinction can be drawn. That formal teaching in grammar does not necessarily result in improved writing has been established on this side of the Atlantic for many years. And finally, we Americans are no less convinced than our British counterparts of the unity and indivisibility of English, although we might view its component elements in terms differing somewhat from those of Ezra Pound, whose qualifications as an educational thinker or a philosopher of language will almost inevitably strike us as somewhat dubious.

In short, we encounter no essential differences with respect to the general educational situation, the unity and centrality of English, the importance of literature, or the danger inherent in the manipulation of language in a television and radio-ridden culture.

So much for the unity underlying the teaching of English in the two nations. It is impressive, both in breadth of view and depth of understanding. Yet, I have a feeling that the English and we arrive at these common conclusions by way of somewhat different paths. For this reason, I should like to suggest my own rationale of the place of English in the curriculum, which, I must admit in all honesty, may be an individual rather than a representative view.

---

[2] See Denys Thompson, "The Aims and Purposes of Teaching English in Britain," p. 7.

I would take as a starting point the centrality of language to the human experience, to our existence as human beings. By serving as a vehicle of communication, language makes cooperation among individuals possible, and in so doing, it serves as the very basis of human society. Writing, too, has made its social contribution by rendering us independent of human memory and of human presence, without benefit of electronic or mechanical aid.

In our society, as in any other, one important purpose of education is to transmit, to preserve, and to improve our social heritage. Ours happens to be a democratic one. Rightly or wrongly, we believe in it, and, understandably, we want to preserve it. Once we grant this, it follows that our principal educational responsibility is to prepare the oncoming generations for intelligent participation and responsible leadership in such a social order. Our vast society, constructed as it is, can survive only as a result of human cooperation on a scale greater than has been attempted up to this time. Language, as I have already said, is a prime factor in this cooperative endeavor.

Unfortunately, there are certain features and developing trends in the United States which work against this cooperative potential. We occupy a huge area; our population is still growing rapidly. Moreover, many social and economic problems are no longer local in scope, as they once were, but have become matters demanding national attention. The more people there are, the greater the distances to be spanned; and the more complex the problems, the more difficult cooperation becomes. Although we have succeeded in overcoming time and space by means of jet travel and electronic tubes, we are not yet adequately prepared to cope with this change. We can talk with Alaska or Hawaii at a moment's notice, but have we something worthwhile to say to them, and can we communicate it? This is the kind of Thoreauvian question which does not permit an easy answer.

In the light of all this, it would seem that the first charge upon our educational system is to develop in the students who are to be its products an improved ability to communicate and a will to do so, thus assuring the social cooperation necessary for our continued future existence. There is both a productive and receptive aspect to the communicative process. The first demands an articulate public; the second calls for a critical public. Unfortunately, we have not yet achieved either. Too many of us shrink from the lectern and put down a pen with dismay when a situation demands precise and well-reasoned expression. Too often in public and in private life, we feel no responsibility to the language in which we try to communicate. In the Baconian terminology, we have become neither ready nor exact men.

We are not a nation of critical readers, nor are we immune to the verbal tricks and skills of the huckster. We are tolerant of nonsense, a notoriously easy prey to slogans. We forgive lapses in logic quite as easily as we forgive lapses in taste, if indeed we recognize either of them as lapses. We are at a point where we can no longer afford the ease and laziness of the inarticulate, the lack of a critical sense, the preservation of a wide-eyed naivete. Unless we amend these shortcomings, we run the risk of forfeiting our social and cultural heritage.

Improving the language command of the almost fifty millions enrolled in our schools is no small task. It will involve a judicious combination of linguistics, rhetoric, and logic. Training in the basic language patterns and adequate exercise in ways of expanding them is the primary element in developing an articulate public. Success here will require all the resources of linguistics to help us devise the most effective teaching procedures. On the receptive side of language, we shall have to give increased attention to logic, to guard us from the intentional and unintentional flaws of those who seek to move us to action. We must depend heavily upon semantics to provide us with armor against the verbal juggler. To put it somewhat brutally, we must frighten our men of affairs into logic, into intellectual and verbal integrity. In a sense the greatest and most important task falls to the rhetorician. Properly considered, rhetoric must be presented as something more than a collection of verbal devices calculated to make language appealing and persuasive. It has a moral charge as well. It should develop in the student both a sense of responsibility toward the language he uses and toward the soundness and justice of the ideas he intends to communicate.

As we look forward in this country to life in the coming decades, another area emerges in which instruction in English is destined to play a major role. We have accepted the fact that people generally will have more time on their hands, a consequence of increasing mechanization and automation. Talk about a thirty-five hour working week is now so common that it no longer surprises us when we hear it. It is only when the figure goes down to thirty or twenty-five that we begin to register shock and wonder what people will do to fill up the remaining eighty-seven waking hours in a seven-day span. Certainly as a society we cannot run the risk of filling up the increased time at our disposal with the vapid, the thrill for the sake of thrill, the purely physical excitation. Basket-weaving, B-grade movies, and beer can scarcely be expected to occupy the hours with satisfaction to many. If history teaches us anything, a failure here would seem to be an invitation to the decay of our civilization and culture.

The time is ripe, therefore, for a reemphasis upon literature, among other things of course, in all the forms that it has traditionally assumed. Nor need we necessarily limit ourselves to the traditional. There is no reason why we should not transfer the standards of excellence we demand and are accustomed to in the drama and the novel to the newer forms of expression, the livelier arts, the mass media—or whatever one may wish to call them. If we develop a mature criticism, a public taste, and a vocal public in connection with these media, standards of excellence will emerge. We shall get better vehicles—grudgingly, of course—but we shall get them. To bring this about will require greater sensitivity to literature and language than we have succeeded in developing today in most of our students and, sadly enough, in many of our teachers. It will require a literally "new" criticism, adapted to our time and needs.

In considering these matters, we must not, however, be led into the error of assuming the total learning potential, the knowledge or behavior of a people, solely in terms of what is taught in the schools. For example, American men are, with a few notable exceptions, what might be called mechanically literate. They have a feel for engines and machinery. They seem to know what makes wheels turn, what makes parts fit together, and what to do if the wheels will not turn or the parts do not fit. One can almost see this particular aptitude progress, generation by generation. It is not taught, directly or indirectly, but appears to be an instance of education by osmosis.

American women also seem to have, though in a lesser degree, something of an instinct for color combination, a flair for the decorative, a way of making things genuinely attractive—when they are not deluded or hoodwinked by professional fashion designers and interior decorators. People in certain other countries have an instinctive sense with respect to painting and music.

I cannot believe that these are inherited racial or national traits. They seem in every case to stem from an environment so pervasive that it plays upon the individual from childhood on. There is no reason why a sensitivity to language and literature, an articulateness, a linguistic competence, should not also in time become so integral a part of the atmosphere that it would not operate in like manner. But this will happen only if we as a profession are far more determined and effective than we have been in the past.

I have chosen to deal with the role of English in the curriculum in these broad terms because I am convinced that the demands of the future upon the language competence and literary experience of millions of our countrymen will be so stringent, so critical, so necessary to our continued functioning as a democracy and as a potent force in a world in crisis that we shall have to gear our education to them. We shall be faced with the necessity of making many decisions: what to teach, when, where, and how to teach it. But only in the light of a broad, an informed, a forward-looking view of the place of language and literature in our culture and in human society, can these decisions be made with adequate foresight and intelligence.

Suggested Methods for Realizing Our Common Goals

Marion Edman

As an American teacher, also concerned with teaching the mother tongue and its literature to youngsters, I cannot quarrel with Professor Thompson's analysis of the aims and purposes of teaching English. That there is little consensus among teachers in his country, I can well understand. Certainly we in this country are in no greater agreement about our stated aims and purposes and, perhaps, in even less agreement concerning our practices than he tells us is the case with teachers in Britain. However, most American teachers would agree fully with Mr. Thompson in decrying the increasing mechanization and materialism of our present-day life and our feeling that somehow human values must be preserved; in recognizing and deploring the use of our language to mislead and confuse the public through the cacophony of modern mass communication, which reaches into every life and every phase of life.

We, too, understand full well the paucity of experience with life and language which characterizes the children of large segments of our school populations and which impoverishes their ability to think and to communicate. At the same time, we remember that our English language is one of the richest in the world in vocabulary, in expressing the finest shades of meaning, and in voicing the greatest ideas ever conceived by the intellect of man. These underprivileged children are like electric cords with no means of "Plugging in" to the powerful electric current which could transform their lives and their society.

We, too, are convinced that the best means of controlling the colossus of modern technology is to ground children in the best ideals and spiritual values of our culture, be these religious or secular, and to present to them examples of how these values contribute to the good life in the everyday experiences of human beings. Both of these objectives can be met through good literature, at all stages of children's development.

We applaud all efforts to enable children to have adequate mastery over all phases of communication: clear and correct speech; proper mechanics and form in writing, as well as creative self-expression; thoughtful and responsive listening; and, finally, meaningful and critical reading.

Thus, I think most Americans agree with Mr. Thompson fairly well on the *what* in teaching our common mother tongue. The tasks we set ourselves are, without question, a tremendous challenge and an almost overwhelming responsibility.

Only in part does his paper discuss the *how* of attacking these tasks. I should like, in my discussion, to consider briefly, but in somewhat more detail than he has been able to do, some of the methods which we need to use in order to achieve success in the goals we have set for ourselves. In discussing five such methods, I reflect primarily from the point of view of teaching children in the elementary grades (preadolescents), which is where my chief professional interest lies.

1. We need to begin at once to teach basic skills of communication (including speech, listening, reading, and writing), not as isolated skills but as closely interrelated and interdependent skills. This idea, by no means new, is often violated by fragmentation of "subjects" into neat half-hour compartments, even at early grade levels. I think we agree that communication grows out of experience or a need for experience. It is not difficult to see how speaking and listening are the first fruits of any given experience, be it firsthand or vicarious, and then quite naturally, that writing and reading follow.

In this process, we need to recognize that in speaking and writing even very young children use practically all of the basic sentence patterns in the English language and can begin early to refine and differentiate the meanings of words. Yet, too many teachers give them reading materials (usually in our basal readers) which seldom vary from the infantile pattern of subject, verb, object. The studies of Walter Loban, Ruth Strickland, and others hold great promise for improving understanding and practice in this area. Exercises in sentence building have great fascination for children, as does practice in refining meaning. Five- and six-year-olds with favorable cultural experiences can find forty to fifty words which refine the meaning of *boat*. Children in less favored circumstances enjoy using at least four or five such refinements, once they have been helped to see the differences among boats through the aid of pictures, or better yet, a visit to a port.

Very early, too, children can begin to see the uses to which words are put. When Johnny responds to his mother's call to come home with "In a minute," what does *minute* mean to him? What to his mother? If he has enough exercises of this sort, perhaps he can one day learn to interpret correctly such statements as Huey Long's famous prophecy, "Fascism will come to America, but we will call it democracy." Or the recent utterance of the Grand Dragon of the Ku Klux Klan who reported to his followers after his hearing before the House Un-American Activities Committee, "Loyal patriots are being persecuted." Very early the child begins to ask: "*Who* said this? *Why* did he say it?" Such questions lead him to an understanding of motives in communication.

Children should early experience fun with the sound and rhythm of words. I suppose no one has done more for the English language in recent times than the inventor of the term "supercalifragilisticexpialidocious." Children are fascinated by it, repeat it, sing it, and even learn to spell it with great gusto and enthusiasm, even though they may have problems differentiating between "was" and "saw."

2. My second point is related to the first: if language is to be meaningful to children, it must take its departure from the individual's own background and interests.

Concerning background, we must remember that much of the reading materials, whether they be the child's first reader or Shakespeare's plays, are outside the family pattern of many children or our modern culture pattern. Religious leaders are asking what the average city dweller makes of such allegories as "a sower went forth to sow," or such similes as "all we like sheep have gone astray." Similarly, the modern child may find the exploits of Ulysses tame compared to those of astronauts, or the idealism of King Arthur pale and weak when viewed in the light of an Albert Schweitzer. Our answer to such dilemmas is that we must first teach the child to understand the written and spoken word in terms of the culture he knows and understands. This often means the postponement of reading the traditional and the classical to a much later time than when it is ordinarily introduced. It may even mean substituting material which is more modern but has a similar theme. Until such time as we feel that the traditional can bring real meaning to the modern child, we must help him find beauty, truth, idealism, and courage in the modern world, expressed in the modern idiom. This may mean substituting the sounds of the city for the call of a lark; the symmetry of a freeway for that of a mountain.

Furthermore, the way to communication from a child and with a child is through his individual interests. Many research studies concern the interests of children at various age levels, particularly as they refer to reading. These have certain validity for any given child, but not enough certainty so that the teacher can with assurance present certain topics or certain books to John Smith, aged ten. She must observe John Smith in his chosen topics of conversation, know what he does with his free time, watch him as he voluntarily selects reading material. Sometimes only experience can reveal his individuality.

Last summer I tried in every possible way to learn the interests of a ten-year-old with the reading ability of a six-year-old so that I might exploit his desire to learn more about these interests through the printed word. Questioning him, bringing easy books on every imaginable topic, firsthand experiences, all led me nowhere. This child seemed interested in nothing, until one day I took him for his first visit to the zoo. He passed by lions, monkeys, and hippopotami with hardly a polite glance and without any comment, but when we arrived at the reptile house he came alive. He asked questions, ventured guesses, even volunteered the scanty information he possessed about these fascinating creatures. Unfortunately, this experience ended my work with the boy, but I wager that he would have been able to read even rather difficult materials concerning something he really wanted to know and would have done so with eagerness. This enthusiasm might have served as a bridge to other interests.

All of this means that our established curriculum of a comparatively small number of "classics" or "readers," a copy of which is in the hands of every child, will no longer do as our program in reading and literature. We must have much that is modern and contemporary but which, nevertheless, parallels the old in its insistence on presenting high ideals.

Most important of all, we must find for each child what has significance for him in terms of his background and unique relationship to the wonders of life. In doing this, it is just as important to consider the privileged and the precocious as the underprivileged and the dull. Every society seems to have its fair share of both extremes. Fortunately for the English speaking world, we have a richness and variety of materials suitable for fulfilling these aims, requiring only our resourcefulness and imagination in its utilization.

Parenthetically, I should like here to comment on our responsibility for guiding the teaching of English language and literature in those areas of the world which, temporarily at least, have borrowed ours as a means of achieving literacy and a sense of community with the Western world. A writer on comparative education has told about visiting a classroom in India, where in a setting of intolerable heat and with scarcely the ability even to repeat the teacher's pronunciation of the words, a class was bravely struggling with Shakespeare's beautiful sonnet:

> Shall I compare thee to a summer's day?
> Thou art more lovely and more temperate.

One need hardly comment that such unsuitable material adds nothing to learning a language nor to appreciating a beautiful idea expressed by a greater master.

3. My third point may seem to contradict the last, and perhaps it does in certain aspects. It is my belief, however, that some of our literary heritage is of such universal appeal that practically all children, regardless of special background or interest, can be led to derive both enjoyment and understanding from it. I mention a few selections which I would nominate for such consideration: nursery rhymes, certain counting rhymes, old folktales with their keen insight into human nature and foibles, and other materials of high quality which are selected because they are particularly significant and dear to the teacher. These should be read aloud, preferably by the teacher, should be discussed, laughed over or cried over, as the case may be, illuminated by other arts such as music, drawing, dramatization, or rhythms, as may be appropriate. These common selections must be few in number and may often be condensed or adapted from their original; but they should leave lingering and pleasant memories in children, who, hopefully, will someday be awakened by more sophisticated literature. Speaking for myself, I would present *Winnie the Pooh, Charlotte's Web*, and *The Little Prince,* hoping

that my own enthusiasm and pleasure in these old friends would communicate itself to the children. For other teachers, the selections will be different, according to their particular loves and enthusiasms.

4. My fourth point is that we need experiences and literature for children and youth which place the individual in a human setting understood by the age group which is being taught. This means presenting reading materials which clarify the individual's attempts to relate himself to his peers, his family, his community, and his world. That these attempts will sometimes end in success, sometimes in failure is desirable for children to understand. This type of literature should also clarify the problems imposed on the individual by unusual personal, cultural, and environmental situations. Particularly in my country, we need to make available to children and youth many books which present with some realism the lives of minority groups, such as rural youngsters, Negro children, or children whose parents cling to other cultures than the usual patterns, as well as books dealing with "foreign" cultures. With the increasing need to "make human" all inhabitants of a shrinking world, we are constrained to present the people of many cultures in terms of their common humanity, expressed so so well in Shylock's famous speech, and made clear to children through their own common experiences.

These books, while helping youth to understand humanity as human, can also help him to see himself in better perspective. As he compares his own life and experience with others', a sense of proportion concerning his culture and his own place in it often begins to take shape. Perhaps he can in this way even develop a sense of humor, that most important means of maintaining balance in a world which often seems so badly out of balance.

5. Finally, in regard to the *how* of teaching our language, we should take advantage, as fully as possible, of all the means of modern technology at our command. The motion picture and still slide, while not a substitute for real experience, can serve a satisfactory purpose. The tape recorder and the phonograph record can supply the voices of the famous for us. Who can forget hearing Robert Frost reciting his own poems, or Maurice Evans telling stories from ***Winnie the Pooh?*** What greater pleasure can there be than listening to a class's recording of their own dramatization of ***The Three Billy Goats***

Gruff? Television and the movies are often decried by the teachers of reading and literature as either supplanting the pupils' need for reading on their own or introducing them to materials of poor taste. Yet we must not forget that *Mary Poppins* and other children's classics continue to attract large audiences in theatres and that television has presented wonderful versions of *The Bluebird* and other classics. Even programed learning may reveal techniques and methods which will push the child into realistic competition with himself in improving his basic language skills. Certainly, if well and wisely used, modern technology can be an aid to the printed word, making it more vital and meaningful to larger numbers of children than books alone can do.

This paper began with a statement of agreement concerning the goals for the teaching of English language and literature as Denys Thompson presented them. I have discussed briefly some of the methods which I believe teachers must use to reach these objectives. Perhaps there are differences in our culture, though not in our language or in our literary heritage, which necessitate differences of approach to our common goals. But we hope that areas of common ground exist where we can help those teachers who teach children of different languages and of different heritage, as well as help ourselves to do better by our own children. As teachers in a small and bewildering world, we have common responsibilities to children, no matter what our tongue or nation.

Discussion on the Ends of English Instruction

The opening discussion at the conference began with a brief consideration of the fundamental unity, as opposed to the diversity, of the English language, and the inherent importance of developing common aims. All participants agreed that the diversity of our language creates many problems, but most of these problems are specific in nature and application. The participants acknowledged little variance when looking at objectives in general terms, but found themselves differing on the purposes to which language can be applied and taught when demands are specific. For example, such problems were noted in the United States where the profession is dealing with a vast population spread over a large continent; certainly specific aims of instruction differ in teaching language to children of rural Mississippi and to those of the inner cities of Detroit and Chicago. Most participants agreed, however, that the unity of our language is far more impressive and important than the diversity. At this point in the discussion, the participants turned their attention to one of the major topics of the conference—the aims and purposes to be developed through a literature-based English program.

Denys Thompson first noted the widespread belief in England that the essence of English is a sound literary education, illustrating this statement with a quotation from Boris Ford: "The most striking improvements are achieved when the teaching of English is not confined to its more utilitarian aspects." To emphasize his point, he used an admittedly crude and illusive cause and effect relationship: if the student writes bad letters, it is because he does not read enough Shakespeare. British teachers, he claimed, are now abandoning efforts to teach students directly to pass examinations in favor of stricter study of literature—in the belief that if students do not do well on the examination, it is because they have not read "deeply" enough. He reported that the results thus far have been most gratifying.

Randolph Quirk then raised the question of the contribution of literature to linguistic behavior. He referred to the growth of the idea that traditional grammar is inadequate and wrong, and that merely changing to a modern grammar will result in improved teaching. He stated that linguistics as a panacea has not been proved true, but the contributions of wide reading of literature to linguistic behavior, as suggested in Thompson's Shakespeare statement, have been tried and tested and found to be valuable. At the same time, teaching language as language certainly can be intellectually fulfilling much in the same light as teaching facts about the Magna Carta of the execution of Charles I, as long as the mysterious fermenting of knowledge suggested in Thompson's Shakespeare experience is present.

At this point, Marion Edman brought up the problem of fragmentation in aims and presentation. Perhaps a sounder approach might be to intertwine the teaching of the many aspects of English. James Squire noted that this plea recurs time and again throughout the papers; he was disturbed that so little help is offered to teachers who wish to interrelate studies. Sybil Marshall felt that teachers often try to teach children to do something that they cannot or will not do themselves. Others suggest that attempts to unify our efforts and goals might begin with the problem of relating ends in the various aspects of English. Philip Penner agreed and suggested that the aims be threefold: to teach (1) knowledge, (2) skill, and (3) appreciation. He added that if grammar is taught with only skill in mind, the results are inevitably disappointing. Can teachers think of aims as one thing and outcomes as another? Mr. Quirk believed that sensitivity is the overall aim and that certain outcomes may be incidental, but he admitted that the three components go hand-in-hand. For example, children can learn to *talk* and *read,* but such activity is of little consequence if they do not learn to *think.* Certainly, then, these aims are concurrent and not separate. J. N. Hook, Richard Corbin, and William Brown reported that students at the elementary and secondary levels who were exposed to imaginative literature wrote much more extensively than students in normal classes. This, they claimed, represented strong support for a literature-based program and for belief in concurrent aims. But there were other participants who had found through experience that the literature-based program is not always so desirable or effective. Ronald Baker, for one, noted that his department members often observed that those who respond best to semantics and are most active in class are those who are most suspicious of literature. Similarly, Joseph Mersand stated that a literature-based program would be entirely ineffective when dealing with the lowest 25 percent of students to whom literature means little or nothing. However, he added that work has been in progress to provide a literature of significance for these students in the form of two series of books entitled *Live Stories* and *Call Them Heroes.* These books, specially directed in both interest and ability level to below-average students, can be instrumental in creating a lasting interest in reading in some students who would, by no other means, have any interest.

II

Literature, Language, and Composition

Literature Teaching in English Schools

George Allen

There is nothing like foreign travel for raising questions about what we usually take for granted. But I wonder whether for me this moment of travel really is foreign. Nobody could have the time that I once had in the United States—a year of it by the banks of the Charles—without feeling that here is also home; I think of the Charles along with Mersey, Aire, Rhine, and now Sussex Ouse. And I was lucky enough to study English with that good man and scholar, Theodore Spencer; he died too soon, but not before he had helped many of us to realize for ourselves, at a time when such ideas were less commonly expressed than they are now, that literature is indeed concerned with the whole condition of man. This was of course personal good fortune. Yet even apart from the personal, the two countries have so much in common that an Englishman visiting schools in the United States, as I did recently, or an American visiting schools in England, could easily forget which country he is in. Perhaps this is what makes differences and variations in pattern where they occur so instructive.

This paper was originally intended to concern itself with language as well as literature, but space prohibits discussion of both these subjects. It must not be thought, however, that because I or the group from England represented in this volume will probably on the whole have more to say about literature, we are therefore indifferent to language. For literature as much as real language study has often been a victim of the outworn language teaching, often instilled without inner conviction, which in too many of our schools still forms a substantial part of English as a whole. The central field of English still tends to be thought of in terms of efficient impersonal communication, in writing—usually about nothing in particular—inculcated (literally "ground in with the heel") into the pupil with the aid of textbooks, in the hope that once the examination has been passed, English will somehow be remembered and used effectively later on. What a fond hope. Not only does this approach take up time much needed for other things, particularly speaking and reading, but it also helps to make English, including literature, a rather tedious business which many pupils are glad to put behind them once they have "done" English for the examination:

> If it were done when 'twere done, then 'twere well
> It were done quickly.

As for literature, this is overlaid with the same prosaic, textbook-ridden, examination-centered approach, in which one learns not to read books but to answer questions about books. You can see the beginnings of this process not far from Boston at Sudbury in the two pages from the *Second Reading Primer* engraved in brass and enshrining "Mary had a little lamb" outside the old school house where this poem began—the poem is followed by some questions such as "Why did the lamb follow Mary?" I can assure you that some of our literature teaching in England is still basically of this kind.

The truth is that language and literature alike will find their true place and thrive only within a conception of English which does justice to them in terms of the development of the student, whatever his age, as a whole human being. In language the change of outlook has been none the less dramatic for being gradual. We are all at long last beginning to see that appropriateness within a context is a better touchstone than the marmoreal correctness which does not even befit the decent obscurity of a dead language—for Latin and Greek were never really like that. And this new descriptive approach to language is at every point a natural ally to the student of literature; neither can do without the other, since, as has often been said, it is in literature that language reaches its highest expression and literature is in words.

One reason why some of us from England can speak more easily about literature than language is that we have yet to learn all we should about linguistic studies. Perhaps, too, those of us who work in schools also suffer from certain reservations—inhibitions you may call them. Within the field of language we are moving relatively slowly not only because we have so much to learn but also because we fear that the newer approaches to language, if adopted too uncritically, might come to be taught like the old, absorbing time on the timetable which is not there, taught a priori (whatever the theory) and examined with apparently beneficial but really devastating results. So we hesitate even now to choose from all the tempting grammars outstretched before us, each displayed in attractive packaging, each offering different advantages and limitations rather like different projections of the earth's surface onto a flat plane for the geographer. Our first and overriding concern, in which language study certainly has an important place, must be to develop the main conception of English a little further, so that grammar, new or old, transformational or structural, is servant and not master; it is not only a question of what grammar to teach but also of to whom, when, how, and how much of it. And with a curriculum already overloaded we have reason to be concerned about any claim for large-scale systematic instruction in this field. Of course the teacher himself needs a right understanding of the central principles of language, and so in the long run does his pupil. But we see the young student gradually acquiring a sense of form and structure out of his speaking, reading, writing, and so on; it is similarly through use that he will acquire the greater part of what he needs to know about language. Particularly over the pupil's earlier years we look warily even at the language course which claims to proceed inductively, since even this implies a more or less conscious and perhaps premature effort to pass from particular to general; we see the basic approach to language as being unconscious, mainly practical, and not to be hurried. Such an approach, of course, presupposes knowledge, care, and discretion on the teacher's part, and here indeed a huge job needs to be done within the context of a better approach to English as a whole.

We see our way more clearly in terms of literature. Here is perhaps the central element within English for any civilized people; it is concerned not merely with education but with the transmission and very nature of our whole pattern of culture. Certainly a main way to "The Vision of Greatness," for ordinary as well as gifted students, lies through the great books; to read these with love and understanding is to become more truly a human being. Other contributors to this series of papers have expressed better than I the greater part of what needs to be said about the role of literature within English; in such space as is left now I want to come down to some of the hard realities of everyday teaching.

For one may well ask about the gap which still too often exists between our theory and our practice. It is far too wide. In one school there are exciting and intelligent developments, reading wide and deep, a general sense of discovery, children reading and writing poetry and other forms of creative work, keeping journals or producing magazines, listening to the remarkable B.B.C. sound broadcasts, or acting in plays. In others the pupils are expected to learn the right things to say or to write about what they read, rather than to enjoy the experience itself. In between the best and worst are many schools in which literature is sincerely taught, but there is much room for improvement.

This improvement can come only if the individual school accepts it. Within any one school in England the head teacher has absolute responsibility for the curriculum; his freedom, though limited by various outside factors, remains very real. None of us would have this otherwise; it may slow down the rate of apparent change, but what is taken to heart is likely to be applied in practice. This freedom does, however, involve a much greater responsibility for servicing schools and teachers with books, information, and a generally adequate brief than any of us appreciated until very recently, and we have much to learn from our American friends. Not enough has been done to tell the individual school about new ideas or developments in practice. In particular our provision for inservice training is inadequate, and even the United Kingdom equivalent of *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English* remains to be written. Improvement here is one of the chief objectives of the English program recently adopted by the new "Schools Council for the Curriculum and Examinations" as one of its first objectives.

The initial instruction of many who teach English in school is often so sketchy as to be barely existent. And it tends to be in literature that many teachers, themselves perhaps the product of unsuitable English teaching in schools, are weakest, for lack of their own reading. English lags behind many other subjects such as science or physical education in the public regard accorded to its requirements; for these subjects in unskilled hands may be lethal, whereas "no congressman's daughter ever died of a split infinitive." But many of our pupils have lived a little less because they never discovered how much books can offer. Some of them teach English later on. Many teach English for part of the time in addition to their main work in some other subject, and not all of these show the resource of the young science master who took a lesson for his English colleague and in the course of *The Merchant of Venice* was asked by a boy, "Does 'the quality of mercy is not strained' mean 'strained through a sieve' or 'being pulled too tight'?" There was no help from the textbook, and after deep thought the scientist saw daylight: "Can't you see it says the quality of mercy is *not* strained, so your question doesn't arise."

Not less than physical education, home economics, handicraft, or science, English, too, has organizational and material needs, "which in our case we have not got" as a rule. Home economics, for example, is often taught in half classes, English nearly always in the largest groupings. Yet a bleak room crowded with students and desks and without sufficient number of the right books is not enough, particularly for civilized reading or the discussion of books.

I do not wish to embark on a discussion of examinations or to condemn all of these on principle; some kind of evaluation may be necessary at a particular point, and the alternatives to external examination are not foolproof. But our traditional examinations, particularly those now disappearing, taken at eleven and those taken at sixteen have pressed hardly upon literature. Between the Scylla of set books, which puts a premium on rote knowledge, and the Charybdis of no set books, which puts a premium on memorized generalization, the way is narrow (two marks each for Scylla and Charybdis, one off for any wrong spelling). We know all too much about testing and its effects upon teaching. As the forsaken maiden used to say in melodrama, "Be guided, Fair Lady, by my sad fate," if indeed large-scale testing and objective assessment are being currently much discussed in the United States. This is their affair entirely, but we have learned much about assessment from within English; too much concern with testing in literature, however sophisticated, warps the teaching in the direction of the test until the test matters most. And today's experiment soon becomes tomorrow's vested interest. I see that in the words of a recent article in *Time* about the new proposals, "No one child would take a whole battery of tests, and no teacher could profitably direct his teaching towards the questions";[1] but even so, I have my doubts. It is fair to add that the best of the newer examinations in England are more promising than the old, but even they have their danger:

---

[1] "Federal Aid—The Head of the Class," *Time*, 86 (October 15, 1965), 60.

> O cuckoo shall I call thee bird
> Or but a wandering voice?
> State the alternative preferred,
> Give reasons for your choice.

We are still too concerned with the examination as opposed to the curriculum; a main aim of the Schools Council's English program is to redress the balance.

A particular problem arises with the young people of below-average ability and with all those referred to as disadvantaged; we are striving to bring our educational system to a point at which it will do justice to these boys and girls. Our present dilemma is that to confine the experience of great literature to the abler pupils, leaving the others to play about with space fiction and other forms of contemporary work, is to divide the school population irretrievably into two classes; yet the traditional diet of classics involves a command of language and range of interests that the weaker pupils very likely do not possess. To force the classics down reluctant throats is worse than useless. Then how does the teacher interpret? For, as the Newsom Report states: "All pupils, including those of very limited attainments, need the civilizing experience of contact with great literature and can respond to its universality, although they will depend heavily upon the skill of the teacher as an interpreter."[2]

The task is not impossible, since, in a number of schools, disadvantaged children are already being helped to enjoy the visions of greatness through literature. How can we make their experience more general? But this brings me back to the teacher; we have done too little to help him, first, to enjoy books for himself and, second, to discover how to introduce young people to books both new and old in a meaningful way. And this brings me back full circle to initial and inservice training. It is fair to say that a concerted effort is already being made by serving teachers, training colleges, university departments or institutes of education, librarians, and many others to improve the curriculum and the teaching, and to make sure that schools acquire, possess, and make the right use of the right books. We are, for example, rather proud of the use of books which mark our best primary school work; a wide range of books is being used creatively in a way which is certainly reflected in the boys' and girls' writing. There are schools doing exciting work in the most unpromising slums, and other schools whose work with able students culminates in sixth forms. But even after taking all this into account there remains an immense amount to be done. And as our own English program begins to get under way, we shall make good use of all that is going on in the United States under the Office of Education and in other ways; conversely we may have something to offer them, and there is all the making of a good dialogue between us.

---

[2] Ministry of Education, ***Half Our Future.*** A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England), John Newsom, Chairman (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1963), p. 155.

I would like to turn now to a deeper discussion of our reasons for taking literature so seriously. We should not claim unanimity in this; I have already mentioned the tendency still common to think of English too much in terms of communication skills, with literature as a kind of traditional extra. This point of view may reflect not so much unawareness of books—though that often plays a part—as the pressure from outside for "results," often of a rather limited kind: such pressure may reflect an entirely proper concern with the communication needs of the disadvantaged. And yet those who think too narrowly in such terms still seem to me wrong, not least in an age of technology. What values will the next generation bring to its increasing leisure, and in any case does not a diet of unrelieved communication defeat its own aims at any age or stage? For *what* is communicated? Not merely efficient business or other similar writing, important though this may be on these occasions when the business man is not using the telephone. If English is to claim a central position in education, it must be because it can introduce us into the whole range of experience which words are about. And reading, real reading, is at the heart of this experience.

The dead can still speak to us as though they were alive, and even the living can speak in a way rather more considered and reflective than is usual in speech. King Lear, Hamlet, and Prospero become contemporaries of ours; so do Keats, Edward Lear, Mark Twain, and Yeats. The challenge to the teacher is of course to help the pupil to see this for himself. But the basic reason for taking literature seriously is that living is a serious matter. The experience of books can go deep, affecting the reader's sense of values, helping him to understand something of experiences for which he is not yet ready, to enter into the mind and heart of people very different from himself, to work out some of his own difficulties through this vicarious experience (though just how far to press the therapeutic value of literature is a moot point). Many of us have looked at walls in a new way after reading Wordsworth or Robert Frost; we have died and been reborn in *The Winter's Tale;* we have glided with love-sick Lucy Snow through Villette till we saw M. Emanuel in the Park under the moon; we have had remarkable but very real experiences with Dickens' children; we have sailed to Byzantium with Yeats. The physical world for a moment seems unreal by contrast. "The living are more shadowy than they." Not that the imaginative experience of books involves a retreat from living or is a substitute for real life; it is rather something which can help to interpret and deepen the experience of living.

The experience of books begins early; I still vividly recall the books read to me at school at nine, ten, and eleven—read well, for the most part, and without comment. There is no such subject as English at this stage, and there should not be anything formally called literature. How far then should the early approach to books and reading anticipate the later by introducing boys and girls, quite early and inductively, to the underlying principles of "structure," in the currently fashionable sense of the term? Can one prepare them in this way for more considered reading later? Here I would say briefly that on the whole our thinking and the practice of our best primary schools would not go as far as current American thinking and experiment. Perhaps the difficulties lie not so much in theory as in practice and priorities. We are all for the teacher knowing and sharing the background of what he is reading with his children, and many colleges of education introduce their students as adults to children's books so that they know something about *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* or *Alice in Wonderland* or *The Wind in the Willows* or *The Hobbit,* considered each in its own right; of course *Gulliver's Travels* can be read in different ways at different stages. There is plenty of scope for the teacher's adult understanding, which, sometimes merely in the tone of his voice or through the odd comment made at the appropriate moment, can add immeasurably to the general liveliness of understanding. Of course the children should take part and may discuss, but it seems to me very easy to go too far; even if the children are able to answer questions, they do not necessarily understand, and Piaget has shown us the dangers of premature verbalizing. Our main concern is that young children should associate books with delight, interest, and wonder. It is in their creative speaking and writing—both likely to be deeply influenced by what they read—that children are most likely to show (rather than discuss) the beginnings of structure.

The main development of critical power is likely to come later. It begins naturally as an essential element within the reading process; how much we owe to the seminal teaching of I. A. Richards, who insisted that we could not criticize without reading properly. And Dr. F. R. Leavis has made his mark upon his generation in England, not only at Cambridge, insisting that literature is a serious study concerned with how we should live, and that the literary-critical is a true discipline, training intelligence and sensibility together; for me he is in the line which goes back to Matthew Arnold, poet, critic, and H.M. Inspector of Schools. Here is a definition of the purpose of criticism by L.C. Knights, King Edward VII Professor of English Literature at Cambridge and a former pupil of Dr. Leavis:

> The proper discipline of literary studies is that inherent in a creative responsiveness to the imaginative use of language. It is a training of the intelligence in which receptiveness and the active grappling powers of the mind are simultaneously enlisted; and the ultimate aim, at any level, is that taking up into the self—not as inert possessions but as new powers—of the insights embodied in all, genuine literature.[3]

Here is the "sequential" program. Its discipline is severe, involving not merely subject matter, though that is needed, but also the whole personality of the student as he develops; this is the discipline of the creative artist who is determined to achieve his awakening vision. The intellect appears to come in the middle of the spiral: above as below is the immediate experience. Here, as Dr. Leavis claims, is a true discipline for our ablest students, as they approach maturity.

It must be stressed at every stage that the ultimate aim is not to know *about* Peter Rabbit, Huckleberry Finn, Macbeth, or Stephen Dedalus; it is to enter into these books, to read them with full understanding and enjoyment. We have often forgotten this. Certainly the facts need to be known and held in their proper shape and context and to master all that is needed may be hard work, but that is no substitute at any age or stage for the final direct apprehension. The teacher, as master of ceremonies, must see to it that his students have a fair chance of achieving this for themselves.

---

[3] L. C. Knights, quoted by W. H. Mason in Basil Blackwell, *For Teachers of English* (Oxford: University Press, 1964), p. 5, reprinted from "The Claims of English," *Universities Quarterly*, May 1955.

To conclude, England and the United States surely have much in common. For neither of them is literature a soft option. All of us are dissatisfied with the inert nature of much teaching of literature as we find it. Thinking in England is perhaps less cerebral, more concerned with attitudes and habits, which we feel enter deeply into true understanding. It may be that often our teaching is not systematic enough, though I sometimes suspect that literature in both countries is often overtaught and underread. The experience of books is ultimately part of the process of coming to maturity; the maturing process is essentially a personal matter, and the boy or girl who can enter into the experience of books is likely to grow into a larger and more complete person. That is why the experience of literature should be central in education, and it is to this end that all are working.

Teaching Literature in American High Schools

Elizabeth Bennett

My present wish is that our Olympian topic could somehow allow me to digress and descend to my personal wanderings in the groves of Academe. For, if space allowed, I would like so much to relate how, as a Fulbright exchange teacher, I arrived in London, trunks laden with typewriter, texts, and notes, all prepared to read Chaucer and Eliot with a sixth form, yet how I found myself assigned to teach a simplfied edition of *Pilgrim's Progress* to 2-2's and 4-T's in a secondary modern girls' school just beyond Moll Flanders' Mile End, near the remains of a crumbling leper hospital, which the Prioresse would perhaps remember.

I wish I could find adequate words to praise the headmistress, a stern but loving, commanding but jolly native of Bath. That woman would delight the heart of David Holbrook (yet she often curdled the tea of some of the Dickensish mistresses on her staff, elderly spinsters or unhappy wives who still favored shrieking and hairpulling to remind the little ones not to forget their Gideons). The headmistress actually had the temerity to ignore the sneers and grumblings of a few staff members as she arranged an elaborate, total-school program and literally filled the school building with roses to surprise me and to honor some other American exchange teachers living in the London area.

Early in the first term the headmistress and an amiable geography and history teacher decided to let me help with the school journey. In preparation we read *Northanger Abbey, Pride and Prejudice,* and many other works all winter and through the spring. Finally, in May, we took thirty-five girls, who had travelled previously only to the amusement park at South End, for a week of study in Bath, with daily tours to historic places: Wells Cathedral, Berkeley Castle, Clavering Manor, the American Museum, Longleat, Castle Combe, and other lovely Cotswold villages.

In planning and implementing enriching educational experiences for their students, our headmistress, and so many others who head England's secondary schools, are indeed attempting with competence and dedication to make, as Holbrook calls it, "a citizenry worthy of its poets."

I wish there was space left in which to describe the persons and places I enjoyed most in the British Isles, but I must ignore these reminiscences of my congenial year and move on to my vast topic, a description of the teaching of literature in American secondary schools. At this stage in our educational history, it is impossible to discuss precisely *the* program of literary studies in the United States. There is here no uniform national curriculum set either by a government agency or by a professional society. Thus, in a nation which prizes individuality and local autonomy, one may expect to find considerable diversity of intention and approach among the 100,000 English teachers who serve an ever increasing, ever changing, ever more complex secondary school population. To cite the statistics on enrollment patterns in our comprehensive secondary schools is to reveal at once both the nature and the complexity of the task facing the teacher of literature in today's schools. In the 1930's, only 51 percent of our youth between ages fourteen and seventeen attended high schools. By the beginning of 1950 the percentage rose to 85 percent, and today we find 92 percent of this fourteen-seventeen age group crowding our classrooms. Fifty percent of those who graduate this year expect to go on to higher education.

It is, I think, lamentable but understandable that during the 1930's and 40's we concentrated primarily on the achievement of basic forms of literacy as the new millions swarmed through our corridors. In our early efforts to cope with the whole range of human intelligence, we made many adjustments, which, I am afraid, too often did not call for full exercise of the powers of mind. Now, however, we seem to see the achievements and shortcomings of our educational system in a larger perspective, one which allows us to repair one defect without creating others. Today our general goals look toward the achievement of higher forms of humane literacy.

I can best describe the transformation that seems to be taking hold in our schools by reviewing the role of various nationally influential agencies. Although we have no national curriculum, no national examinations, we do have several lively professional societies that provide the centripetal force giving new direction and purpose to the study of English in general and to the study of literature in particular. And, very lately, even the United States Office of Education (USOE) has begun to spend money on the beleaguered humanities. Through its support of fifteen English Curriculum Development Centers and through institute programs for the retraining of English teachers in grades K-12 the USOE has given new impetus to the reform movement that began late in the 50's when the NCTE, the MLA, the College English Association, and the American Studies Association met together in 1958 to identify the "Basic Issues" in the teaching of English. This occasion marked the beginning of serious collaboration between high school and college English teachers. Now there exists a growing relationship with the universities, advancing to what might be called "the puppy love stage," and representing a degree of cooperation between high school and college English teachers that would have been declared impossible ten years ago.

This recent happy collaboration of classroom teachers and research scholars in programs of curriculum study sponsored by NCTE, MLA, and the Commission on English has moved us toward a refocusing of English upon three overlapping areas—literature, composition, and language. Since both the NCTE, through the work of its commissions and committees, and the MLA, through its publications, have issued important statements on the teaching of literature, I shall limit myself to summary and restatement of the position advanced by the Commission on English, an independent agency supported by the College Entrance Examination Board. The Commission's work generally reflects the tenor of what is happening in the literature programs of the schools I know best.

In its preliminary statement of 1960, the Commission proposed adherence to the following general principles in teaching literature.

> Reading for class-time study should be of two kinds: (a) matter on many topics, not necessarily literary, to stimulate intellectual interest and to exemplify compositional forms; (b) literature in English and in translation. The proportion will vary from grade to grade, but the especial obligation of the English teacher is always to the second, to literature. In the four-year program each of the major forms—poetry, drama, fiction, the essay, literary biography—should be fully represented, and their representation should come not from contemporary culture alone but from the whole span of our literary tradition. Translations of literary

> merit, for works not otherwise accessible to the students, may reasonably make up a part of the formal curriculum, but the major emphasis should be on English and American literature. The ideal is not "coverage" but concentration on a few dozen unabridged and unaltered masterpieces high in interest for the adolescent learner. Assigned "outside" reading may be either more concentrated or more catholic in range, but the emphasis in quality should be maintained.
>
> Equally important to a sound program for the study of literature is a careful allocation of materials to each year in a soundly articulated progression in knowledge and understanding. Through accumulated experience a student completing the last year of high school may develop a sound appreciation of literary forms, a useful vocabulary of literary terms, and a secure command of the ideas and art of a respectable number of major works.[1]

Even while the Council and other national groups were debating the Basic Issues, various schools in the San Francisco Bay Area of California were conducting major revisions of their curriculums—Acalanes, Palo Alto, and San Leandro districts, to name a few. But I can best describe the turn of events at Berkeley High School where three or four teachers and I, in 1958, set about on our own time to redraft the design of our sequence of study in literature. By 1960 we had underway an experimental program which now offers both streams of our tenth grade college-bound students an introduction to poetry and ritual drama, accompanied with integrated composition assignments. Attention is focused on themes connected with the universal concerns of man: love, heroism, human weakness, moral responsibility, the search for wisdom. Classes read, discuss, and listen to recordings of *Oedipus the King, Antigone, Everyman,* the Prologue to *The Canterbury Tales* and "The Nun's Priest's Tale," *Henry IV, Part I,* and other selected modern plays and poems. In the second semester of the tenth grade we move to the *Odyssey* (using various translations), selected Russian short stories, either *The Cherry Orchard* or *Uncle Vanya,* sometimes *Cry, the Beloved Country* or *Out of Africa,* and Macbeth.

For the first semester of the eleventh grade, we devote our attention completely to American literature with such works as *The Scarlet Letter, Billy Budd, Adventures of Huckleberry Finn, The Red Badge of Courage, The Crucible, Death of a Salesman, Mourning Becomes Electra* or *The Hairy Ape, The Great*

---

[1] *Preliminary Statement* of the Commission on English (Boston, Mass.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1960).

Gatsby, Intruder in the Dust, selected poems of the early poets, and Whitman, Dickinson, Frost, Eliot, and others. During the second semester of the eleventh grade we study the novel by genre using *Lazarillo de Tormes, Moll Flanders, Pride and Prejudice, Wuthering Heights, Vanity Fair, Fortitude, The Return of the Native, Heart of Darkness, Lord Jim, To the Lighthouse, The Common Reader, Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man,* and other novels.

At the twelfth grade level, college-bound students in our "spiral curriculum" rediscover some of the forms and concepts to which they were introduced at the tenth grade as they review *Everyman* and read *Murder in the Cathedral, Agamemnon, The Canterbury Tales* (in Middle English), *Hamlet, Volpone, Caesar and Cleopatra, A Man for All Seasons,* selected works of Donne, Spenser, Blake, Milton, Pope, and the Romantic and contemporary poets.

During the second semester many of our students enroll at the University of California for courses of their choice while continuing their high school courses. Many of these students elect a final literature course in high school, where readings, discussions, and independent study include Aristotle, Plato, Dante, Montaigne, Swift, and other essayists, anthropologists, philosophers, satirists, and poets. Such twelfth grade students are asked increasingly to bring their knowledge of classical rhetoric, as well as their knowledge of contemporary linguistics, to bear upon the study of all forms of literature. They are often asked to analyze what Wayne Booth has called "the rhetoric of fiction."

Because we believe in excellent works for all children, we are continuously moving works down into the lower streams in an attempt to enrich the literature study throughout the city school program. Through coordination of our readings, such as the *Iliad,* folk legends, sagas, narrative poetry of merit, and Biblical stories, students in grades seven through nine will be assured of an introduction to the works and concepts which form the literary and cultural heritage of England and the Western world.

Our reforms and experiments in California have been in progress despite the fact that most of our teachers have had to retrain themselves to handle materials from the humanities, despite poor school libraries and lack of audiovisual equipment and materials, despite large classes, and despite capricious censorship from bigoted pressure groups.

To see how far we have progressed, one need only to glance at the literature anthologies, which before paperbacks were the sole texts for our use all through the 30's, 40's, and on into the 50's. In those drab or synthetically slick volumes, one can plainly see that it was not merely in the Depression bread lines that our citizenry was starving; the intellectual fare which textbook makers and publishers offered the teachers and youth of the United States was indeed thin and mouldy. Only the "safest" writers were included, and to borrow a quip from Dorothy Parker, texts "ran the gamut from A to B." It is little wonder, then, that we felt in 1957 part of the common concern to reform the "parlous situation" into which the teaching of English in our country had drifted.

Often classroom teachers reach no agreement on the merits of various approaches to literature. Some of the differences have been settled by the Commission, which in its final report, *Freedom and Discipline in English,* has evaluated various course patterns—the chronological-historical survey, the literary theme arrangement, and the literary type or genre approach—concluding that "each has advantage; none is free of pitfalls; and all will work in the hands of skillful teachers in a responsibly staffed English department."[2] Whatever the pattern of arrangement, the Commission believes that the literary work and the approach to it must animate the student's critical intelligence, teach him responsible reading and appreciation of literary form, and offer him command of the ideas of a number of important masterpieces of which he must expect a careful examination. (A look at some of the Commission's model End-of-Year Examination topics and questions reveals striking similarities to the Advanced level G.C.E.[3] The great differences, though, are in range and preparation. With the great diversities in our literature programs, neither the Commission nor any other national body would consider proposing "set books" any more than they would consider proposing a national curriculum.)

In its final report, the Commission argues persuasively against national curriculums which "stifle experimentation, limit inventiveness, and hinder, if they do not actually prevent, adaptation to local needs." The Commission's liberating conception of an English curriculum as a structure that takes form through a continually evolving departmental consensus places the teacher at the center in curriculum decisions. Such a conception of curriculum making means that programs will vary from school to school. But the Commission states that "To accept the facts of unavoidable variety is merely to recognize that curriculums in literature must respond to the needs and interests of teachers and students in varying communities and in changing times."[4]

---

[2] *Freedom and Discipline in English—Report of the Commission on English* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965), p. 51.

[3] General Certificate of Education. See Frank Whitehead, "Examinations and Literature," pp. 137 and 138.

Discussion on the Teaching of Literature

Discussion revolved around the concept of a literature-based English program. One significant reason for emphasizing a literature-based rather than language-based program is the prevalent danger of going too far into teaching language, leaving no time for reading and literary study. Literature and art, while dealing with the "how" of expression to a degree, are also concerned with the condition of man. Perhaps, then, literature has an innate social purpose; and social purpose is certainly an important part of any educational system.

George Allen emphasized that the major problem in England is that literature is overtaught and underread; i.e., too much time is spent reading *about* literary works instead of reading the works themselves. Leonard Dean was concerned with the revision of a required freshman English course at a large university. Mr. Allen suggested a plan for a bulk of varied readings, beginning with modern works and moving back in time. Early writings would be based on the literature and would expand from there with the understanding that not all the writing need be about literature.

All agreed that firsthand experience is important when dealing with literature. This experience can be extended and supplemented in many ways; e.g., through films, theatre, and art. Elizabeth Bennett reported that her high school program has been most successful in bringing Shakespeare into the sphere of experience for both slow learners and deprived children. This program provides for *Romeo and Juliet* and *The Taming of the Shrew* to be presented in class. The reenactment makes great literature pertinent to even the slowest learners.

The general conclusion of the discussion was that literature has many avenues to be exploited in making a literature-based English program a richer part of the student's experience.

---

[4] *Freedom and Discipline in English—Report of the Commission on English* (New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965), p. 47.

Types of Deviance in English Sentences

Randolph Quirk

This paper, with the accompanying tables, is derived from a monograph, *Investigating Linguistic Acceptability,* written in collaboration with J. Svartvik and published by Mouton (The Hague) in the Janua Linguarum series. I have confined myself here to an aspect of the research in progress in the Survey of English Usage at University College London, leaving others to deal with English language problems as they affect British teachers. I hope it will be agreed, however, that the issues discussed in the paper have an immediate relevance and a reasonably direct application to language learning and to the teaching of English.

Considerable attention has been paid in recent years (as the references at the end bear witness) to questions associated with linguistic deviance. In the Survey of English Usage, our task is to chart the range of English used by native speakers of university education, and we made it clear at the outset that this must involve both the study of spontaneously produced texts (spoken and written) and also investigation into the explicit and implicit tenets of acceptability—the code of "linguistic morality."[1] We have therefore been interested in what can be found out about native reaction to deviant sentences.

English can be deviant of course in many ways, as we see from the following selections:

1. Him and her don't want no cake.
2. I am living here since two years.
3. Little a boy the ran street up.
4. Colorless green ideas sleep furiously.
5. For several people to have walked out would not have surprised me.

Example 3 has too gross a disorder to be of interest in the present discussion; example 2 manifests deviance of which only a foreign learner is likely to be capable and this type also will not concern us here. On the other hand, the deviance present in example 1 is only an extreme form of the type of problem found in *Who did you see?* or *It is hard to completely succeed* and thus impinges on the native speaker's everyday experience. Similarly, example 4 is an extreme (if now widely familiar) instance of the child's misselection in *When does the bus begin?* or the poet's deliberately "deviant" selection in *Golden slumbers kiss your eyes.* The relevance of example 5 will be clear to anyone who has ever marked an essay.

---

[1] Randolph Quirk, "Towards a Description of English Usage," *TPS 1960,* 54 (1961), 60.

Concentrating on sentences showing various kinds of deviance most relevant to native speakers, we finally evolved a form of experiment which would explore people's reaction in such a way as would (a) help us categorize types of deviance, and (b) provide some insight into the kinds of difficulty our subjects encountered. The implications of both (a) and (b) for linguistic structure are discussed briefly in the latter part of this paper.

Basically the experiment consisted of a test in which informants were orally presented with sentences which they had to change in a stated way by performing one of eight simple operations. Responses (given in writing) were subject to a strict timing; sentences to be tackled followed each other at twenty-second intervals. It was an important condition of the test that informants had no idea that their reaction to deviant sentences was the object of interest; the deviant sentences were presented in a scrambled order and they were interspersed with many sentences that were perfectly regular. The latter were introduced also to act as a check on each informant's ability to perform each type of operation. The required operations, which were explained with examples before the test began, were as follows:

"Turn the verb of the sentence into the present tense."
"Turn the verb of the sentence into the past tense."
"Make the sentence negative in the usual way."
"Turn the sentence from negative to positive."
"Replace [a given singular subject pronoun] by [a given plural subject pronoun]."
"Replace [a given plural subject pronoun] by [a given singular subject pronoun]."
"Turn the sentence into a question beginning with [a given form of the verb *to be*]."
"Turn the sentence into a question beginning with [a given form of the verb *to do*]."

The set of sentences in test order, with abbreviated details of the operations and of the results obtained with the two sets of informants (28 in Group I, 48 in Group II), is presented in Table 1.[2]

In performing an operation such as "Make the sentence negative," an informant would find one of three situations:

1. the sentence was perfectly regular and gave no difficulty, such as *The woman sat opposite me* becoming *The woman didn't sit opposite me;*
2. the sentence was deviant and the informant might stumble in performing the operation or change the sentence in performing it or of course carry out the operation retaining the deviance as in *A wife was chosen his son* becoming *A wife was not chosen his son;*
3. the sentence was perfectly normal but confronted the informant with a necessary selection of forms on performing the operation, as in *He dared to answer me back* becoming *He dared not answer me back, He did not dare to answer me back,* etc.

In the case of (3), "Selection Test," the results are given in Table 3. In the case of (1) and (2), the written responses were scored as follows: A—complete compliance; A (B, C, D, E)—compliance with evidence of hesitation (such as deletion), B and C indicating hesitation over "peripheral," lexical, and grammatical items respectively, D and E hesitation over "central" lexical and grammatical items respectively; F, G, H, I, J, and K indicate noncompliance or failure in some respect to perform the operation, F being peripheral lexical failure, G peripheral grammatical, H central lexical, I central grammatical, J peripheral omission, K central omission, JK total omission. The results are summarized in Table 2.

As soon as each group of informants had completed the "operation (and Selection) Test," fresh paper was issued and a "Judgment Test" took place. Informants were now asked for their direct impression of each sentence in terms of a three-point scale:

> The sentence is natural and normal.
> The sentence is unnatural and abnormal.
> The sentence is dubious and marginal between these extremes.

The test sentences were read out again, in the same order as before but at five-second intervals, and the above response types are totaled in Table 1 as "+," "−," "?" respectively. These totals display gradience from unanimous acceptability to unanimous unacceptability, contradicting those who, like Putnam, stress the general ability of speakers to make a sharp polarization of sentences as "acceptable or unacceptable."[3]

---

[2] For the transcription system, see D. Crystal and Randolph Quirk, *Systems of Prosodic and Paralinguistic Features in English* (The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1964).

Space forbids an account of the use made of comparisons between the Operation and Judgment results or of the scrutiny that was carried out on the Selection results. While it became increasingly clear that categorization falsified the essentially gradient and mixed quality of sentence-acceptability, the clustering of result types allowed one to see for the most part a broad distinction between lexical and grammatical acceptability, and certain nodal points within these two broad areas:

I: LEXICAL
(*a*) congruent
(*b*) obscure
(*c*) incoherent

II: GRAMMATICAL
(*a*) established
(*b*) divided
(*c*) ill-established
(*d*) dubious
(*e*) unacceptable

I (*a*): This category accommodates most of the sentences in the test battery, irrespective of the gross success or acceptance scores in the Operation and Judgment Tests. What is crucial is that there should be no central or peripheral lexical failures in the Operation Test; this is equally true for Tests 2, 35, 38, 29, 24, to quote only a few examples with sharp differences in other respects. The classification of the Operation Test results thus interestingly provides for the independence of lexis from grammar, inasmuch as a sentence can be grammatically highly deviant without being regarded as lexically deviant.

I (*b*): In this category, the lexical relations cause sufficient resistance for the sentences to score low acceptability results in the Judgment Test but not sufficient to prevent a reasonably high success score in the Operation Test; for example, Tests 16 and 41. The category includes sentences whose problem some informants feel to be lexical and others grammatical (as in Tests 15 and 45), and thus contrasts with category I (*a*) in showing the interdependence of lexical deviance and grammatical deviance. It would seem that it is to this category that lexical deviance of a metaphorical or figurative kind is to be referred, and the viability of a figurative lexical relation perhaps accounts for the degree of Operation success achieved with Test 41. Such an area of deviance is least susceptible to satisfactory study by means of isolated sentences. Even in relation to grammar itself, "stripping a sentence to its minimum . . . is a risky test of grammaticality: it often falsifies the potentialities of the construction."[4] With lexical relations, the potentialities are obviously still more sharply and easily fasified. If it were textually embedded in such a sequence as

---

[3] H. Putnam, "Some Issues in the Theory of Grammar," *Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics*, 12 (1961), 29 ff.

Day was over and the shadows were lengthening as I approached the forest; dusk was creeping up between the trees.

there can be little doubt that Test 16 would have both a high success and a high acceptance score. While this shows that other tests must be developed for a fuller exploration of the "obscure" category, the validity of the present categorization and the type of test on which it is based are alike confirmed by the fact that on this basis an important collocational difference can be demonstrated between *dusk* + *creep* and (say) *child* + *creep.*

I (*c*): In this category, we have not only low acceptance scores in the Judgment Test but a scattering of failure types in the Operation Test suggesting a deviance so great that many informants could not perceive any structure, lexical or grammatical. The results of Test 27 amply illustrate the fact that a lexically deviant sentence cannot be perceived as grammatically nondeviant and may be perceived as entirely incoherent. As with the "obscurity" of I (*b*), so with the "incoherence" of the present category; the classification is relative to a degree of textual isolation the allows the category I (*a*) to emerge. Even *Friendship dislikes John* could doubtless be contextualized so as to be perceived as coherent, but that does not make it lexically congruous. Compare Chomsky's discussion of *Golf Plays John* (1961, 234ff.).[5]

II (*a*): In this category we place sentences given a high success and a high acceptance score: for example, Test 1 and the other "control" sentences. On this basis, all sentences classed as II (*a*) must also be classed as I (*a*), emphasizing the primacy of lexical congruence, since, as we have seen, a sentence is not perceived as grammatically nondeviant (that is, there will be central or peripheral grammatical failures) if it is lexically deviant.

---

[4] D. L. Bolinger, "Linguistic Science and Linguistic Engineering," *Word,* 16 (1961), 377.

[5] Noam Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* (The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1961), p. 234 ff.

II (*b*): By "divided usage" we understand competing forms which are acceptable and, broadly speaking, equally so. Sentences are therefore assigned to this category partly on the basis of approximate parity in the Operation and Judgment scoring, with fairly high success and acceptance results, and partly on the evidence that informants make changes to introduce both the competing forms. The most direct evidence comes of course in the results of the Selection Test. Examples are Tests 11 and 36, where there is switching from *whom* to *who* and from *who* to *whom* in identical grammatical environments. The effect of many generations of prescriptive tradition in grammar teaching is to some extent felt in this category (in preventing, for example, either of the competing forms from winning unanimous acceptance), as also in the next.

II (*c*): This category embraces structures of various types brought together only by the fact that rules governing their form and use appear not to be well established among users of the language. Examples may include minority competitive forms that might otherwise seem indistinguishable from those in divided usage (for example, Tests 7 and 17); structures like the fifth example of deviance discussed at the beginning of this paper, for which through unfamiliarity, rarity, or complexity, or a combination of these, native speakers seem to lack a clear *Sprachgefühl* (for example, Test 34 and the correlative construction in Test 47); structures in which there happens to be no "right" usage—the situation that we obviously have in the variants given in Table 3 for Test 22. The score characteristics for this category are a fairly high acceptance level in the Judgment Test and a scatter of results in the Operation or Selection Tests.

II (*d*): Tests 6 and 39 would seem to be good examples of a category labelled "dubious." The Operation success rate is only fair and few informants are prepared to make acceptance responses in the Judgment Test. On the other hand, there is not a majority for rejecting the sentences, and a fairly large number of informants register "query" responses. A rather wide range of sentence acceptability should probably be recognized here, from the mild discomfort evidenced in the results for Test 6 to the acute dislike of Test 44 (thirty-nine Operation successes, four Judgment acceptances), which closely approaches complete rejection as ungrammatical.

II (*e*): In this category we place sentences which (as the results suggest) could scarcely be uttered naturally by a native speaker except as a *lapsus linguae* or a joke: Tests 5 and 25, for example, with their extremely low success and acceptance rates. It would of course also include the sentences like *Little a boy the ran street up* which, through never perhaps "mouthed by poet or peasant,"[6] have tended to be taken in recent years as the type of the ungrammatical sentence.

The relation of the prescriptive tradition to the problem of acceptable usage is an obvious starting point if one seeks the relevance of this inquiry to the teaching of English. That is, we are concerned with the existence of rules and the extent to which rules are teachable. Other issues that arise are "medium deviation" (the use of an informal or spoken expression in a formal or literary context), the notion of "ordinary" as opposed to "difficult" usage (such as the special or metaphorical language of a poem), the distinction between lexical and grammatical "difficulty," and the question of "rectifiability." Indeed, more generally, one is brought face to face with the whole question of establishing the native speaker's ability to comprehend and construct sentences.

---

[6] J. Lambek, "On the Calculus of Syntactic Types," *Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics*, 18 (1961), 167.

Table 1
GENERAL SCORE TABLE

Test Details				Group I Results				Group II Results				Conflation				Percentage					
No	Operation	Instr Order^a	Test sentence	Op Success^b	Judgment			Op Success^b	Judgment			Op Success^b	Judgment			Operation Success^b			Judgment (+ only)		
					+	?	−		+	?	−		+	?	−	I	II	I&II	I	II	I&II
1	inversion question	os	They /always còme here#	28	28	0	0	47	47	1	0	75	75	1	0	100	98	99	100	98	99
2	present	os	/Jack admired sincèrity#	27	26	2	0	48	42	5	1	75	68	7	1	96	100	99	93	88	89
3	inv. qu. I neg. II	so	I was /sat opposite by a strànger#	18	0	10	18	37	0	5	43	55	0	15	61	64	77	72	0	0	0
4	past	so	He /wants some càke#	27	28	0	0	47	48	0	0	74	76	0	0	96	98	97	100	100	100
5	inv. qu.	so	/John works there èither#	18	0	0	28	22	0	1	47	40	0	1	75	64	46	53	0	0	0
6	positive	so	He /isn't much lòved#	22	15	10	3	41	7	31	10	63	22	41	13	79	85	83	54	15	29
7	plural	so	It's in the /front of the stàtion#	20	23	3	2	29	30	16	2	49	53	19	4	71	60	65	82	63	70
8	inv. qu.	so	You /painted your fence blûe#	28	27	0	1	46	45	3	0	74	72	3	1	100	96	97	96	94	95
9	singular	so	They /ăren't# but they pre/tènd to be#	24	26	2	0	44	41	7	0	68	67	9	0	86	92	89	93	85	88
10	negative	so	He /dared to answer me bàck#	S	26	2	0	S	44	3	1	S	70	5	1				93	92	92
11	present	os	/Whom did you sèe#	26	16	9	3	34	39	5	4	60	55	14	7	93	71	79	57	81	72
12	inv. qu.	os	He is /silly and crỳing#	8	9	16	3	26	15	23	10	34	24	39	13	29	52	45	32	31	32
13^c	present	os	Neither /he nor I knew the ànswer#	26 S	26	1	1	48 S	42	4	2	74 S	68	5	3	93	100	97	93	88	89
14	plural	os	He is re/garded insàne#	23	9	10	9	37	11	22	15	60	20	32	24	82	77	79	32	23	26
15	inv. qu.	os	/Food was lacked by the chìldren#	20	6	9	13	37	9	20	19	57	15	29	32	71	77	75	21	19	20

Table 1 (cont. a)

GENERAL SCORE TABLE—continued

Test Details				Group I Results				Group II Results				Conflation				Percentage					
No	Operation	Instr Order[a]	Test sentence	Op Success[b]	Judgment			Op Success[b]	Judgment			Op Success[b]	Judgment			Operation Success[b]			Judgment (+ only)		
					+	?	−		+	?	−		+	?	−	I	II	I&II	I	II	I&II
16	present	os	/Dusk was creeping up between the trèes#	23	21	4	3	34	20	14	14	57	41	18	17	82	71	75	75	42	54
17	negative	os	The /old man chose his son a wife#	25	15	8	5	44	16	16	16	69	31	24	21	89	92	91	54	33	41
18	inv. qu.	os	It's the /man to whom I spòke#	22	21	4	3	36	35	10	3	58	56	14	6	79	75	76	75	73	74
19	present	os	We pro/vided the man a drink#	23	7	9	12	22	8	19	21	45	15	28	33	82	46	59	25	17	20
20	singular	os	They /own a large fàctory	28	27	1	0	47	46	2	0	75	73	3	0	100	98	99	96	96	96
21	past	so	I /turn on the light for the room to look brighter#	19	16	11	1	23	20	12	16	42	36	23	17	68	48	55	57	42	47
22[c]	present	so	Neither /I nor he felt a thing#	20 S	20	4	4	36 S	36	8	4	56 S	56	12	8	71	75	74	71	75	74
23[c]	past	so	He /turns to the [misiz] Smith#	a26 b17	15	6	7	a48 b17	16	16	16	a74 b34	31	22	23	a93 b61	100 35	97 45	54	33	41
24	inv. qu.	so	They /painted blue their dȍor#	12	4	4	20	14	0	10	38	26	4	14	58	43	29	34	14	0	5
25[c]	negative	so	A /nice little car is had by mè#	15 (S)	1	1	26	21 (S)	0	1	47	36 (S)	1	2	73	53	44	47	4	0	1
26	inv. qu.	so	/He sits àlways there#	12	2	6	20	11	0	1	47	23	2	7	67	43	23	30	7	0	3
27	past	so	/Friendship dislikes Jòhn#	22	2	3	23	38	3	4	41	60	5	7	64	79	79	79	7	6	7
28	posit I negat II	so	The /woman sat ȍpposite me#	28	26	1	1	46	47	0	1	74	73	1	2	100	96	97	93	98	96
29	past	so	They /don't want some càke#	24	6	6	16	25	10	19	19	49	16	25	35	86	52	65	21	21	21
30	inv. qu.	so	/Bill comes here tòo#	28	28	0	0	45	46	2	0	73	74	2	0	100	94	96	100	96	97

Table 1 (cont. b)
GENERAL SCORE TABLE—continued

Test Details				Group I Results				Group II Results				Conflation				Percentage					
No	Operation	Instr Order[a]	Test sentence	Op Success[b]	Judgment			Op Success[b]	Judgment			Op Success[b]	Judgment			Operation Success[b]			Judgment (+ only)		
					+	?	–		+	?	–		+	?	–	I	II	I&II	I	II	I&II
[illegible]	plural	so	It's in /front of the còllege#	28	28	0	0	46	48	0	0	74	76	0	0	100	96	97	100	100	100
32	positive	os	They /aren't very lòved#	18	2	7	19	31	2	13	33	49	4	20	52	64	65	65	7	4	5
33	inv. qu	os	They /pushed the gate òpen#	28	27	1	0	45	46	2	0	73	73	3	0	100	94	96	96	96	96
34	singular	os	They /ărèn't# but they /clàim so#	26	12	8	8	45	21	21	6	71	33	29	14	93	94	93	43	44	43
35	negative	os	He /needs to go at tèatime#	S	22	5	1	S	37	8	3	S	59	13	4				79	77	78
36	present	os	/Who did you wànt#	26	21	4	3	41	42	2	4	67	63	6	7	93	85	88	75	88	83
37	inv. qu.	os	She is /clever and prètty#	27	27	0	1	45	42	6	0	72	69	6	1	96	94	95	96	88	91
38[c]	negative	os	Both /I and my friend saw the àccident#	27 S	22	4	2	43 S	35	10	3	70 S	57	14	5	96	90	92	79	73	75
39	plural	os	I re/gard him fòolish#	23	4	11	13	33	8	20	20	56	12	31	33	82	69	74	14	17	16
40	inv. qu.	os	/Clothing was needed by the pòor#	28	21	6	1	48	41	6	1	76	62	12	2	100	100	100	75	85	82
41	present	os	I /Wood) ⎱ was creeping II /Timber) ⎰ up the hìll#	26	6	5	17	46	11	5	32	72	17	10	49	93	96	95	21	23	22
42	negative	os	A /wife was chosen his sòn#	13	3	1	24	35	0	4	44	48	3	5	68	46	73	63	11	0	4
43	inv. qu.	os	It's the /girl I spòke to#	26	28	0	0	34	40	5	3	60	68	5	3	93	71	79	100	83	89
44	present	os	[illegible] /food was [illegible]ded the màn#	19	4	3	21	20	0	8	40	39	4	11	61	68	42	51	14	0	5
45	singular	so	They are /owning hundreds of àcres#	16	4	8	16	19	16	17	15	35	20	25	31	57	40	46	14	33	26

Table 1 (cont. c)
GENERAL SCORE TABLE—continued

Test Details				Group I Results				Group II Results				Conflation				Percentage					
No	Operation	Instr Order[a]	Test sentence	Op Success[b]	Judgment			Op Success[b]	Judgment			Op Success[b]	Judgment			Operation Success[b]			Judgment (+ only)		
					+	?	−		+	?	−		+	?	−	I	II	I&II	I	II	I&II
46	past	so	I /stop the car for the children to get òut#	27	25	2	1	44	42	5	1	71	67	7	2	96	92	94	89	88	88
47	inv. qu.	so	Neither /he nor they know the ànswer#	S	23	5	0	S	30	11	7	S	53	16	7				82	63	70
48[c]	past	so	The /Miss Browns are tùrned to#	b25 a24	7	3	18	b36 a33	3	16	29	b61 a57	10	19	47	b89 a86	75 69	80 75	25	6	13
49	inv. qu.	so	He /pushed open the dòor#	24	26	2	0	33	34	11	3	57	60	13	3	86	69	75	93	71	82
50	negative	so	I have a /black Bèntley#	S	27	1	0	S	47	0	1	S	74	1	1				96	98	97

a) os=announcement of required operation followed by announcement of sentence; so=converse.

b) Operation Success='A' set scores: see Table 2.

c) 13, 22 and 38 are scored as 0 tests in respect of the order of the elements operating as subject; 25 is scored as an S test where the passive is replaced by active; 23 and 48 are scored as two 0 tests, (b) relating to 'the Misses Smith' and 'the Miss Browns' respectively.

S: Selection tests; see Selection Test Table (Table 3).

Table 2

OPERATION TEST RESULTS GROUPED BY PATTERN-SET TOTALS

Pattern sets	Grouped Test Numbers and Respective Scores																																		Totals
	1		2								3			4										5				6					7			
	41	9	17	46	34	38	36	6	48^{b}	14	43	18	16	15	11	27	48^{a}	39	49	22	3	32	42	29	7	19	44	21	5	25	45	12	23^{b}	24	26	
A	72	68	69	71	71	70	67	63	61	59	60	58	57	57	60	60	57	56	57	56	55	49	49	49	49	45	39	42	40	36	35	34	34	26	23	1854
F	1	1	1									4				4												3			1				1	16
		(1)													(2)	(2)				(1)	(2)								(1)		(1)	(4)				
G	3	7	1	1	1						9	11	2	3	3	3	5	6	2	2	1	6	7	1			1		1	8	3	5				92
			(1)					(3)				(1)	(2)		(4)		(1)			(2)	(2)	(1)	(4)	(1)	(2)	(3)	(2)	(5)	(1)	(4)	(2)	(2)		(1)		
H													16	7		2					1					1	1			1	10	1				40
			(1)						(1)									(1)	(1)			(3)			(1)			(1)		(2)	(1)					
I			5	3	4	6	9	13	12	16	6	3	1	9	13	1	9	14	17	18	16	18	17	25	27	30	35	28	25	26	27	35	42	50	52	612
				(1)							(1)						(1)				(1)		(3)					(1)	(6)	(2)		(1)				
J																					1	3						1		1						6
										(1)											(1)			(1)					(2)	(2)						
K				1					3	1	1					6	5				2		3	1				2	10	4		1				40
																																				2660

Table 3
SELECTION TEST TABLE

Test number	Range of variants	Group I				Group II				Conflation			
		Total selected	simply selected	selected hesitantly[a]	selected then deleted	Total selected	simply selected	selected hesitantly[a]	selected then deleted	Total selected	simply selected	selected hesitantly[a]	selected then deleted
10	didn(o)t dare to	18	14	4	1	30	30			48	44	4	1
	didn(o)t dare ϕ	6	5	1		7	6	1		13	11	2	
	dared not ϕ	4	4		3[b]	4	4		1	8			4
	dare not ϕ					5	5		1	5	5		1
	durstn't ϕ				1								1
	wouldn(o)t dare to					1	1			1	1		
	dared not to				1	1		1		1		1	1
13	know	20	19	1	1	33	31	2	1	53	50	3	2
	knows	8	7	1	1	14	13	1	1	22	20	2	2
	knows & know					1	1			1	1		
22	he feel	12	10	2	1	24	19	5	1	36	29	7	2
	he feels	9	8	1	2	11	10	1	4	20	18	2	6
	I feel	6	6			7	6	1		13	12	1	
	I feels					3	3			3	3		
	I feel nor does he					1	1			1	1		
	I, nor he, feel					1	1			1	1		
	he are feeling	1	1							1	1		
	(wrong operation)					1				1			
25	have not	1	1			3	3			4	4		
	haven't	1	1			2	2			3	3		
	do not have	1	1			3	2	1		4	3	1	
	don't have	1	1			2	2			3	3		
	have not got					3	3			3	3		
	had not	1	1							1	1		
	did not have					2	2			2	2		
	didn't have					3	3			3	3		
35	does n(o)t need to	23	23		1	38	37	1		61	60	1	1
	need n(o)t ϕ	3	2	1		6	6			9	8	1	
	doesn(o)t have to					1	1			1	1		
	need n(o)t to					1	1			1	1		
	(wrong operation)	2				2				4			
38	neither x nor y	21	19	2		37	34	3		58	53	5	
	both x and y + negative	6	6		2	7	7		2	13	13		4
	neither x or y					4	4			4	4		
	x and y didn't both	1	1							1	1		

Table 3

SELECTION TEST TABLE

		Group I				Group II				Conflation			
Test Number	Range of variants	Total selected	simply selected	selected hesitantly[a]	selected then deleted	Total selected	simply selected	selected hesitantly[a]	selected then deleted	Total selected	simply selected	selected hesitantly[a]	selected then deleted
47	do neither he nor they	11	7	4		12	8	4		23	15	8	
	do either he or they	9	6	3		17	15	2	4	26	21	5	2
	do neither he or they	2	1	1						2	1	1	
	do either him or they					1		1		1		1	
	do either him or them					1		1		1		1	
	do he and they					1	1			1	1		
	do either they or he					1		1		1		1	
	do they or he	1	1			2	1	1		3	2	1	
	do they are he					1	1			1	1		
	do they or him								1				1
	do either of them					3	2	1	1	3	2	1	1
	do any of them					1		1		1		1	
	do neither of you					1	1			1	1		
	does neither he nor they	1	1		3				1	1	1		4
	does neither he or they					1	1			1	1		
	does either he or they	2	2			2	2		1	4	4		1
	does he or they	1	1		1	3	2	1		4	3	1	1
	does either him or they								1				1
	does either they or he								1				1
	do they know or does he know					1		1		1		1	
	does either he or do they	1	1							1	1		
	do(es) . . . knows								2				2
50	have not	3	2	1	1	6	6		2	9	8	1	3
	haven't	11	10	1		20	17	3		31	27	4	
	do not have	5	4	1		13	12	1		18	16	2	
	don't have	2	2			4	4		1	6	6		1
	have not got				1								1
	haven't got	4	4			3	3			7	7		
	have no	3	3			1	1			4	4		
	(wrong operation)					1				1			

a) This refers to evidence of hesitation over the problem centre only.

b) A single instance of "dar" is arbitrarily included here.

REFERENCES

Bach E. *Introduction to Transformational Grammars.* New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston, 1964.

Bolinger, D. L. "Linguistic Science and Linguistic Engineering," *Word,* 16 (1960), 374-91.

——. "Syntactic Blends and Other Matters," *Language,* 37 (1961), 366-81.

Chomsky, N. *Aspects of the Theory of Syntax.* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1965.

——. *Syntactic Structures.* The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1957.

——. "Some Methodological Remarks on Generative Grammar," *Word,* 17 (1957), 219-39.

Crystal, D., and R. Quirk. *Systems of Prosodic and Paralinguistic Features in English.* The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1964.

Hays, D. G. "Dependency Theory: A Formalism and Some Observations," *Language,* 40 (1964), 511-25.

Hill, A. A. "Grammaticality," *Word,* 17 (1961), 1-10.

Katz, J. J. "Semi-sentences," *The Structure of Language,* ed. J. A. Fodor and J. J. Katz. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964, pp. 400-16.

Lambek, J. "On the Calculus of Syntactic Types," *Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics.* Providence: Brown University Press, 12 (1961), 166-78.

Maclay, H., and M. D. Sleator. "Responses to Language: Judgments of Grammaticalness," *IJAL,* 26 (1960), 275-82.

Miller, G. A., and S. Isard. "Some Perceptual Consequences of Linguistic Rules," *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior,* 2 (1963), 217-28.

Putnam, H. "Some Issues in the Theory of Grammar," *Proceedings of Symposia in Applied Mathematics.* Providence: Brown University Press, 12 (1961), 25-42.

Quirk, R. "Descriptive Statement and Serial Relationship," *Language,* 41 (1965), 205-17.

——. "Towards a Description of English Usage," *TPS 1960,* (1961), 40-61.

——, and A. P. Duckworth. "Co-existing Negative Preterite Forms of dare," *Language and Society.* Copenhagen: A. M. Jensen Festschrift, 1961, 135-40.

——, and J. Svartvik, *Investigating Linguistic Acceptability.* The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1966.

Svartvik, J. "A Note on *for* plus Infinitive," *English Language Teaching,* 19 (1965), 134-6.

Ziff, P. "About Ungrammaticalness," *Mind,* 73 (1964), 204-14.

Zimmer, K. E. *Affixal Negation in English and Other Languages,* Supplement to *Word,* 20 (1964).

Sentence Deviance in Linguistics and Language Teaching

Charles A. Ferguson

Randolph Quirk's excellent paper, "Types of Deviance in English Sentences," asserts that the issues discussed in it "have an immediate relevance and a reasonably direct application to language learning and the teaching of English." It is the purpose of my paper to explore these issues and some closely related ones in order to see this relevance and possible application.

Although linguists have almost universally recognized the great variability of language behavior even within a single speech community, they have made their greatest advances in techniques of analysis and sophistication of theory by operating with language as though it were uniform or nearly so. One of the first steps in any kind of linguistic analysis is the delimitation of the range of behavior covered, whether this is done in terms of the identification of a particular speech community or context of situation or in terms of the specification of a corpus to be analyzed. Sometimes this essential preliminary delimitation has been done carefully and explicitly, sometimes less carefully and without explicit statement, but it is always there, and it has often been the exclusion of troublesome "abnormal" language material from consideration which has enabled the linguistic analyst to achieve the precision and elegance he so prizes.

There can, of course, be no quarrel with a working procedure which allows for such handsome results, and I would assume that the main stream of linguistic analysis for some time to come will continue to follow this procedure, seen in its most explicit form possibly in the all-or-none assumption of grammaticality made in some formulations of transformational generative grammar.[1] Quirk's paper, however, illustrates another trend in modern linguistics—the attempt to devise procedures and approaches which will do justice to the extreme variability of human language behavior without losing the great gains of the last century in linguistics.[2] Part of my paper will deal with this trend in linguistics and some of its implications and its problems.

---

[1] Cf. N. Chomsky, *Syntactic Structures* (The Hague: Mouton and Company, 1957), pp. 13-14.

Language Variability and Classroom Teaching

The contribution which linguistics has offered to language teaching, whether native language or foreign language, has been largely concerned either with the transfer to language teachers and textbook writers of certain of the linguists' attitudes toward language or with the use of linguists' precise statements about the facts of particular languages in planning courses or doing classroom teaching. It would be difficult to deny the value of this contribution, even if it does not justify the claims of some of the enthusiasts for a "linguistic method" of language teaching and some of the believers in the magic of courses in "applied linguistics." But insofar as the linguist's perfectly legitimate working procedure of assuming a fictive uniformity in language has been transferred as a basic assumption to textbooks and language teaching, some damage has been done, or, let us say, the full potential contribution of linguistics has not been utilized. Also, insofar as linguists' descriptions of particular languages, presented in the framework of fictive uniformity, have led to poor pedagogical procedures becuase of the need for students to acquire varying patterns of language behavior, a disservice has been done. Accordingly, a later part of my paper will deal—all too briefly—with pedagogical questions.

Up to this point we have had before us as examples of the issues under discussion only the illustrations and test sentences of the Quirk paper. I would like to add an example of deviance which may make clear the general nature of this problem for linguistics and for language teaching. In the Arabic speaking world most uses of the language seem to cluster around two norms, often called Classical Arabic (*al-luğha al-fusha*) and Colloquial Arabic *al-luğha al-cāmmīya.* The former is the vehicle of most Arabic literature and much formal speaking; the latter is the medium of informal communication.[3] Linguists following their usual working procedure of assuming uniformity, have written excellent descriptions of the Classical language and regional varieties of the Colloquial.[4] It is also true, however, that speakers of Arabic in many situations use intermediate forms of the language or mixtures of the two polar types. In a semiformal discussion of a technical subject, for example, the speakers will use vocabulary, forms, and constructions from both norms. Of the hundreds of linguistic studies of Arabic, only a handful have attempted a description of these intermediate or mixed forms of the language,[5] and even these attempts have not been outstandingly successful. What is more, almost all linguistically oriented teaching of Arabic has concentrated either on Classical or Colloquial or each in turn: there is no published textbook which gives the student much guidance on the intermediate or mixed varieties. Instructors of Arabic agree that one of the objectives of Arabic teaching must be to give the students competence in using the in-between kinds of Arabic, yet no one has offered a satisfactory, systematic way of doing so.

---

[2] Cf. *Word,* XIII (1957), 477-8.

[3] For a further statement of the situation see C. A. Ferguson, "Diglossia," *Word,* XVI (1959), 325-40. Repr. in D. Hymes (ed.), *Language in Culture and Society* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964), pp. 429-39.

This example has been offered as a fairly dramatic illustration of the basic issue suggested by Quirk's paper, which may be summarized somewhat crudely in these statements: (1) Much human language behavior is highly variable and full of "abnormalities." (2) Linguists do not yet know how to analyze highly variable language behavior. (3) Language teachers often need to teach such highly variable behavior in order to reach their objectives.

Sentence Deviance

Let us examine four major types of sentence deviance, some of them well represented in Quirk's material, others for one reason or another excluded from his study. Although the discussion here is limited to sentences, it must be noted that analogous types of deviance exist at other levels such as phonology and larger-than-sentence units and in general would show the same kind of relevance to linguistics and language learning. The term *deviance* here, following Quirk's use, refers to samples of language which for any reason are not regarded by users of the language as fully acceptable. It is not intended to suggest that language material can always be fruitfully analyzed in terms of norms and deviations from them.

---

[4] E.g., J. Cantineau, "Esquisse d'une Phonologie de l'Arabe Classique," *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris,* XLIII (1946), 93-140; R. S. Harrell, *Phonology of Egyptian Colloquial Arabic* (New York: American Council of Learned Societies, 1957).

[5] E.g., H. Blanc, "Style Variations in Spoken Arabic," pp. 81-156 and R. S. Harrell, "A Linguistic Analysis of Egyptian Radio Arabic," pp. 3-77 in C. A. Ferguson (ed.), *Contributions to Arabic Linguistics* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1960).

Interference. Some deviance is related to knowledge of other languages or dialects on the part of the speaker. Quirk's illustrative sentence 2, *I am living here since two years*, is an example of this. He says the sentence "manifests deviance of which only a foreign learner is likely to be capable," and excludes this type as irrelevant to his discussion. This exclusion is perfectly legitimate within the terms of Quirk's study, but it must be acknowledged that this kind of deviance, customarily called *interference*, is of great interest and importance for linguists, psychologists, and language teachers concerned with the process of language acquisition.

What psychological mechanism accounts for the kind of interference shown in Quirk's sentence 2? Explanation of this question is bound to produce hypotheses about language behavior of direct value to the linguist who wants to construct a general theory of human language. The extensive work on contrastive analysis of languages is beginning to make some progress here, but the field remains disorganized.[6] Linguists have not yet even agreed on useful procedures for contrastive analysis, and what is more serious, no one has yet provided a coherent theory of interference which would bridge the gap between even the most sophisticated contrastive analyses and observed language behavior.

It is also possible that most of the deviance which we will classify under other major types could also be fruitfully studied as exemplifying interference. Such an approach would see all variability in language behavior as the result of competing norms and mutual interference. At our present state of understanding of this whole process, however, it seems more profitable to limit the study of interference to the most obvious cases and to leave extensions of the concept for later.

The relevance of this kind of deviance for the foreign language teacher is indeed accepted now but we can point out that English teachers in the United States also meet the problem of interference in two general cases: (a) with students who have another language as their mother tongue, including in particular several million Spanish speakers in the Southwest and in New York and other urban centers, and (b) with students whose home language is a variety of English so divergent from the standard as to cause serious problems. In both these cases it would seem that a study of interference as well as of the relevant facts of the mother tongue would be of value to the English teachers.

---

[6] Cf. J. H. Hammer and F. A. Rice (eds.), *A Bibliography of Contrastive Linguistics* (Washington: 1965).

Dialects. Most linguistic research on the question of variation within a language has been concerned with the notion of dialect differences, especially those that can be shown on maps. The systematic study of regional dialect variation which began in Europe in the early nineteenth century had already made a considerable contribution to the linguists' understanding of language behavior before the structuralist approach of the twenties and thirties began its spectacular development. In recent decades we have seen the combination of older work in dialect geography with the more recent insights and methods of structural description,[7] and this promises still greater contribution. Strangely enough Quirk does not even allude to deviance related to regional differences in English. His Operation and Judgment Tests would be quite applicable to this kind of deviance. For example, *I didn't visit him, but I should have done* would be rated much more acceptable by millions of Commonwealth speakers than by North Americans who prefer *I should have* or *I should have done so*. Or the use of the auxiliary *do* with *have* would show striking regional differences in acceptability. We can only assume either that Quirk was not interested in this kind of deviance or that his subjects were too homogeneous by this dimension to make study of it worthwhile.

Another kind of dialect difference is more closely related to the problems Quirk is dealing with, that of *social dialects*. Linguists have generally recognized that the linguistic differences in any speech community tend to correlate, in part, with lines of social cleavage in the community, and the same dialectological machinery of isoglosses, innovations, waves, bundles, and so on can be used in studying social dialect differences. Until fairly recently, however, relatively little was done in social dialects compared to the work in regional dialects, possibly because the latter are so universally mappable, lending themselves more readily to geographic presentation. Another reason has probably been the lack of analyses of social stratification which were as clear and usable as the facts of geography.

---

[7] Cf. U. Weinreich, "Is a Structural Dialectology Possible," *Word*, X (1954), 168-280; and subsequent articles by Moulton, Stankiewicz, Ivić and others. Cf. also S. Saporta, "Ordered Rules, Dialect Differences, and Historical Processes," *Language*, XLI (1965), 218-24.

This field cannot be ignored, however, by anyone interested in questions of grammatical acceptability, since it often happens that what is deviant in one segment of the speech community is accepted as the norm in another segment. Quirk's sample sentence 1, *Him and her don't want no cake,* would presumably have been rejected by most of his university subjects, but I think it likely that there are subjects who would find such a sentence acceptable and would reject a more standard version, although I am not sure that the Quirk techniques, requiring command of the standard language, would be appropriate for the kind of testing needed. This is simply another indication of how customary it is for linguists working on English to limit themselves to the kind of English they personally use. Apart from the pioneering work of Fries some decades ago and isolated examples since then, published linguists' studies of American English have dealt with the kind of English used at universities, forgetting that in some respects it surely represents a minority usage which might be regarded as unacceptable by many speakers.[8]

I labor this point here only to emphasize that not all differences in "grammaticality" are of the same type; they frequently have a close relationship to differences in social dialect and can best be analyzed in connection with systematic study of social dialect phenomena. Quirk notes in two places (p. 49 and p. 51) the relevance of the prescriptive tradition to the problem of acceptability, but he nowhere notes the probably greater importance of the whole structure of social dialects in which standard and prescriptive ideals are both embedded.

Register and style. The two kinds of deviance identified above generally characterize one group of speakers as opposed to another, and each individual speaker normally shows one kind of interference (e.g. Spanish interference with English) or speaks one regional or social dialect (e.g. educated middle class Chicago English). Some kinds of deviance, however, are part of the repertory of each individual in the sense that he sometimes finds one form appropriate and sometimes another. This includes such differences as the levels of formal, informal, and intimate,[9] as well as situational or status-and-role differences such as different varieties for the professor and student, parent and child, doctor and patient, and so on. Differences of this kind are referred to by many British linguists as differences in register, and the term is a convenient one. Quirk in his book *The Use of English* has presented this kind of variation very effectively in a popular way, and he seems to be referring to it by the phrase "medium deviation" in the final paragraph of his paper. The actual experiment he reports, however, seems to exclude this dimension from consideration. It would seem likely that explicit indication of appropriate register or context of situation would have affected the acceptability judgments in certain cases, and that future experimentation of this kind must take more explicit notice of register deviance.

---

[8] For a useful recent collection of papers, see Roger Shuy (ed.), *Social Dialects and Language Learning* (Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1965), especially the chapters by Stewart and Labov.

Another kind of deviance is suggested by Quirk's terms "ordinary" and "difficult" in his final paragraph. This kind is very similar to the traditional notion of stylistic differences and deserves an important place in any systematic study of literature. This kind of deviance includes not only the notion of a distinct literary style or special styles appropriate to different literary genres, but also the individual stylistic differences which seem to occur at all levels, dialects, and registers—literary and nonliterary. Like other kinds of deviance, it needs continued investigation and has obvious pedagogical relevance.

Theory of Deviance

Before going on to comment about pedagogical application, it may be worthwhile to return briefly to the linguists' assumption of uniformity mentioned before. Linguists not only operate with an assumption of fictive uniformity which makes analysis easier, but they also often seem to assume that all variation can best be accounted for in terms of deviation from the uniform language they describe. Perhaps the transformationalists make this assumption most explicitly with their notion of a generative grammar of "all and only" grammatical sentences, plus a set of rules for using that grammar to account for deviant material.

There is no question that the norm-with-deviance view is a useful model of language behavior, but it seems quite probable that it is an inadequate model from a number of points of view. There is, for example, the relatively trivial matter that at certain points in any language there seems to be no acceptable form or sequence—all is deviation. For example, standard American English has no acceptable past participle for *wake;* Quirk's sentence 22, *Neither I nor he felt a thing,* has no acceptable present-tense equivalent.

---

[9] R. C. Pooley, *Teaching English Usage* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1946) especially chapter III, Levels in English Usage; M. Joos, *The Five Clocks, International Journal of American Linguistics,* 28:2 (April 1962).

Second, and more important, is the familiar difficulty of determining the norm: just what should be regarded as "grammatical" or "acceptable"? Whether the grammar is being written for a single variety of a language or for the whole language, the question arises whether the descriptive norm should be based on informant reaction (the so-called "intuition" of the native speaker) or on distribution-frequency measures, or on criteria related to simplicity or accessibility of the description. There are many techniques, statistical and otherwise, for handling variation throughout a corpus or population without references to a norm.

Finally, human beings from a very early age produce with great frequency a wide range of fragmentary utterances, blends, hesitations, omissions, slips-of-the-tongue, and so on. Some of these phenomena are patterned and are very likely learned in much the same way that the "normal" patterns are learned; others may be of quite different origin. In any case, it seems quite clear that before the child has mastered the basic grammar of his native language, he has already "learned" how to misbehave with his language. It seems to me entirely plausible that a grammar which fails to account for "all and only" the grammatical possibilities but can generate an impressive array of abnormalities, i.e. nongrammatical possibilities, could be considered a more powerful grammar—and in some practical ways a more useful one—than a grammar which elegantly generates all the grammatical items but fails to predict any abnormalities.

Pedagogy

Quirk's assertion of the pedagogical relevance of the issues of his paper is well founded, and the discussion in the first two sections of this paper amplifies and emphasizes it. Two points can be made in this connection. One is the great need for additional information about deviance of all types in English so that the data can be used in the preparation of teaching materials and the planning of course content. One reason that students in American schools have not been taught more about American dialect differences is that reliable information about such differences has rarely been available in the form in which it could be used. This is even more true for the other kinds of deviance.

The second point is the need for experimentation in the teaching of variable language behavior. The Arabic example given previously is a clear indication of the need, but the problem is there for almost any kind of language teaching. Almost no consideration has been given to the problem of teaching a student how to shift from one register to another, or one style to another, let alone some of the finer problems of perception and production related to the issues of Quirk's paper.

Language Teaching in Canadian Secondary Schools

Philip G. Penner

Implicit in Professor Quirk's paper, "Types of Deviance in English Sentences," is the assumption that the question of language is in part an open one; that the study, observation, and interpretation of contemporary linguistic habits may perhaps establish a code of linguistic morality truer to the living tongue than that which is generally preached. The paper is thus another example of a fundamental change of attitude, namely, a welcome secularization of traditional and unquestioned prescription, a recognition that some of the gods of language at whose shrines we have worshiped may prove to be false.

There is in Canada a great deal of interest in language. This interest feeds on our nationalism, our biculturalism, and on our "search for identity," the favorite intellectual pastime of heart rending and even garment rending Canadians. But this interest in language gets little nourishment from solid linguistic information. We have no Linguistic Atlas, very little knowledge of Canadian dialects, and a confused and ambivalent double culture in language—sandwiched as it is between the prestige of British usage and the ever present American influence.

My remarks are therefore typically Canadian, caught as I am between the British Quirk and the American Squire—the one wanting something on sentence deviance, and the other asking for a paper on Language Teaching in Canadian schools. My solution of this complex Scylla-Charybdis navigational problem is to discuss briefly what happens to language courses when the question of language is considered closed and when prescriptions based on misinformation guide those who teach language in Canadian schools. I tackle this wide topic with no more assurance of success than we members of the British Commonwealth now sing that rousing song of sanguine imperial expectations—

Wider still and wider,
Shall thy bounds be set. . . .

I shall therefore limit myself to a few personal observations of the Canadian situation in general, then refer briefly to the state of enlightenment or lack of it as reflected in official courses of study, and finally describe briefly the curriculum work now under way in my own province of British Columbia.

In 1867, the British North America Act made education a provincial responsibility by stating that "in and for each province the legislature may exclusively make laws in relation to education."[1] This provision of the B.N.A. Act (as we Canadians call it) has led to the development of ten different educational systems. Thus each of the ten provinces is responsible not only for the organization and administration of the public schools within its boundaries but also for curriculum. Each provincial Department of Education issues course guides for every subject of study, authorizes textbooks, and in terminal courses sets provincewide examinations.

Although it is often argued among Canadian teachers that a provincial program of studies is intended to serve only as a guide for new and inexperienced teachers, and not as a prescription which all teachers must dutifully follow, a provincewide program of studies tends to become "the" course for all students in a particular grade. There are many reasons for this. Although many teachers are willing, able, and courageous enough to develop their own courses while "rendering unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's," the task becomes almost impossible when the courses issued by the authority of the Minister of Education fall far short of the teacher's knowledge of his subject and the needs of his class. It is a sorry tameness of intellect that does not sooner or later attempt to work its way out of the track of the best prescribed courses. But even the most sensitive teacher, eager to move his mind freely and anxious to maintain the intellectual integrity of his subject, often works under a department head who puts gradewide examinations, record-keeping, and course-covering ahead of the genuine concerns of the teacher of English, namely, the achievement by his pupils of knowledge of the language, skill in its use, and appreciation of its best products in literature. If the teacher's answer to the question "What knowledge is of most worth?" conflicts with the housekeeping concerns of the administration, he needs more courage than most of us possess to apply his insights and act as a free and responsible professional. In such a situation, it is not a matter of "rendering unto Caesar the things which are Caesar's, and unto God the things which are God's," but more a matter of trying to serve God and Mammon. But external guidance, no matter how enlightened and useful, must still leave the individual teacher enough freedom of movement to accept responsibility for acting on his best insight and liquidating his own ignorance.

---

[1] Great Britain Statistics, 30 and 31 Victoria, C3, (1867).

In Canada the teaching of language in the secondary school would be far more promising if the public philosophy which fashions our language courses would reflect the present state of knowledge of all branches of English study. Examination of our provincial curriculum bulletins in English, however, reveals not only ignorance of the essential nature of language, but also a naive unconcern about the lack of this knowledge. Here, for example, are official statements from the revised program of language study serving the teachers of a province of over six million people, almost one third of the entire population of Canada. The date is September 1964. Under the heading *Compositions and Language* the following statements appear:

> —The study of clausal analysis as an aid to good sentence structure and the effective expression of thought
>
> —The application of the principles of grammar to the achievement of correct usage in oral and written communication
>
> —The study of grammatical principles where necessary as an aid to clear and accurate expression
>
> —If it is to have real value, the study of grammar must have practical bearing upon the pupil's expression of his own ideas.

Now it would be foolish and unfair to condemn a whole course of study because of some of these statements. My point is simply that there is no excuse for lack of precise and sharp definitions in an official document ostensibly written by people in touch with contemporary conceptions of the subject. There is no excuse for restating the traditional lore when more valid knowledge is at hand. This document has no clear statement to suggest that the study of language has intrinsic value, no suggestion that the close relationship between the study of grammar and the student's oral and written expression is seriously disputed by scholars and is not supported by experience or research. In short, there is no attempt to question the assumption that knowledge of language is static, that high school language texts of the past are quite accurate enough for us today. Calling on the gods of experimentation and inductive teaching will not help as long as the course content reinforces belief in the following myths:

1. The grammar of high school textbooks can be made functional in speech and writing if we just try harder, longer, and louder.
2. Substandard usage can be cured by more grammar.
3. Sophisticated speakers of English are speakers who speak one dialect correctly—the formal and literary one.

"There is nothing so terrifying as ignorance in action," Goethe observed years ago. When that ignorance bears the official stamp of approval of a provincial Ministry of Education, one is prompted to add the cynicism that like so many official documents, this too was conceived in ignorance and born in the provincial capital.

Randolph Quirk's observation that "Our teachers live in a no-man's land between the discredited old grammar and the unwritten new," applies to Canadian teachers of English as well.[2] Surely, a provincial course guide should be aware of this no-man's land and point teachers in directions that might lead them to intellectually habitable territory. To pretend that the no-man's land does not exist is mortal folly. Some might argue, however, that an official course should contain nothing but the allegedly settled and agreed upon, the tried and therefore the true. But we would do well to remember that though the search for intellectual integrity makes many a detour and often takes a wrong turning, it is still the only promise of life, even in the study and teaching of English.

I do not want to be misinterpreted here. There is some good language teaching in every part of Canada. But teachers so engaged often work in isolation and frequently without an official or organized body to support them. For teachers of English, like other professional groups, acquire a vested interest in an established body of ideas and are therefore tempted to concentrate on established techniques and on what they can do well. Changing a curriculum is therefore almost as difficult as moving a cemetery. We Canadian teachers of English exhibit our own brand of conservatism. Like other Canadians, we like to "Wait and see," hoping that the new idea will be but a passing fad or another impossible cure-all. We look hopefully for support from our colleagues in the British Isles, and happily at the absurdities committed by some of the front-runners of our profession in the United States; we watch with some amusement as Roberts emerges from the Chinese boxes of structural grammar and starts swinging on the branches of the tree graphs of transformational grammar; we hear that Chomsky has found his intellectual base in traditional grammar and enjoy the confusion among the disciples of the new. We settle back comfortably to applaud for the wrong reasons James Sledd's sharp, lucid criticisms of the new Establishment. By doing nothing, by ignoring the ferment and the controversy, we have been right all along. But our hands are clean for lack of use, and our minds are at peace because we refuse to direct them to problems of language we do not yet understand. Unadventurousness thus masquerades as soundness.

---

[2] Randolph Quirk, *The Teaching of English* (London and New York: Oxford University Press, 1964), p. 10.

The absurdities that accompany even the most needed changes are innocent when put beside those now deeply embedded in our language courses, in the prescribed language textbooks, and in the restricted view many teachers of language have of their subject. The total effect is to make of the subject which has all the potential of an exciting and rewarding discovery for the student, a decorous trudge through an imaginary garden with real, though unrecognized fallacies in it. How else can we explain the fact that students continue to mistake the successful parroting of linguistic shibboleths and genteelisms for a power of language? How else can we explain the lack of interest and the psychic dropouts evident to anyone who takes the trouble to talk to high school students? The reasons are, of course, complex and varied. But surely one of the most obvious is that teachers lack the authority which only genuine knowledge of the medium can give. If our aim is as Randolph Quirk puts it, "to teach children to explore language in linguistic terms . . . to make pupils understand and react fully to the medium at its subtlest, and thereby to encourage them to exploit the language's potentialities in their own use of it,"[3] then teachers have no choice but to become competent. How is this done?

Let me briefly put before you what we are now attempting in British Columbia:

1. Our Provincial Revision Committee for Secondary English, composed of university and high school teachers and representatives of the Department of Education, has come to recognize that although the authority which makes the course of study an official document comes from the min-

---

[3] Quirk, *op. cit.*

ister, the authority of course content can only come from the intellectual integrity of the statements in it. Hence the Revision Committee is first of all a study committee and sits in continuous revision.

2. The Revision Committee realizes that most teachers are ill prepared for language teaching. Their university major in English (if, indeed, they have one) rarely contains any solid work in the history and structure of the language or in rhetoric and composition. The holding of workshops, institutes, and refresher courses is therefore partly the responsibility of the members of the Revision Committee.
3. The Revision Committee realizes that before high school teachers can become competent explainers and interpreters of various theories of grammar and the complexities of usage, they must gain a background of actual information. The high school courses in language subject to this first round of revision will concentrate on greater accuracy in the description of the language and on the history of the language. That is, the Revision Committee is attempting to provide materials to develop greater sophistication in linguistic matters. The committee is anxious to encourage the teacher to work successfully with new material and help him to close the gaps in his own knowledge.
4. Our Provincial Universities are increasingly aware of their responsibility in preparing competent teachers of English. Though the situation is far from ideal, all teachers in training must now take at least one course in the English Language and Composition beyond the first and second year. Our high school majors take an additional course in linguistics and theories of grammar.

   We hope that the haphazard major in English is a thing of the past, and that soon all English teachers will have a background not only in literature, but also in literary criticism, literary history, history of the language, and linguistics.
5. Like every other Revision Committee attempting to bring language study up to date, the British Columbia Committee has found it difficult to find acceptable texts for its new courses. So far we are fortunate in that one or two have had the blessing of language scholars. But we still have two grades to go before the first cycle of the present revision is completed.

In conclusion, we are trying to develop a language curriculum whose content is based on new knowledge now available to us. We are trying to reduce the chasm between genuine knowledge and present superstitions by stating clearly the proper limits of the subject. Three hundred years ago, Thomas Traherne talked of the folly of misdirected effort and the lack of a unifying principle: "We studied to inform our knowledge but knew not to what end we studied, and for lack of aiming at a certain end we erred in the manner."

We are trying to develop a curriculum in language which has shape and proportion, a design and sequence, one in which there is a discernible unifying aim—to help each pupil as far as he is able to know something of the language, to glimpse its richness and power, and to gain some skill in its use.

Language Teaching in American Elementary Schools

Ruth G. Strickland

The American elementary school teacher thinks of the curriculum in English, or the language arts as the area is commonly called, as consisting of work with language in terms of its four basic functions—listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Children come to school bringing the dialect of their home environment and some skill in both speaking and listening. So the teacher sees her task as one of refining and expanding what the child has already attained and, beyond that, of developing the literacy of reading and writing.

Schools differ in emphasis placed on the oral aspects of language. Many of us are convinced that in too many schools children have little opportunity to improve their handling of oral language because the major emphasis is placed on the development of skill in reading and writing.

The vast majority of children here, as elsewhere, attain control of their group's communication system at about the same age regardless of what that communication system may be. They have mastered the sound system and most of the basic grammatical system by the time they enter school, but the quality of what they have learned covers a wide range. The American population, less homogeneous than that of many countries, shows its heterogeneity most clearly in the language children bring to the elementary school. In some communities all children come to school using the prestige dialect, in others all children have mastered a substandard dialect which can be a lifetime handicap, and in other schools there is a sprinkling of several dialects.

The mobility of our population, which has always been great, has increased tremendously during the last two decades. Many families have left the rural areas for nearby cities and the isolated and depressed regions of the South for the more populous industrial areas of the North and West. Consequently, speech patterns which linguistic geographers found localized in specific geographic areas are appearing in elementary school classrooms everywhere in the country. As people of lower economic and cultural levels take over the inner area of our cities, the former population retreats to suburbia, leaving behind as remnants only the less aggressive and less prosperous. The period of transition is one in which a teacher may find in almost any classroom—a wide range of dialects. As the population shift accelerates or the turnover is consummated, the elementary teacher in the inner city often faces an entire class whose dialects differ greatly from her own.

Deviations from so-called standard usage are found in any elementary school classroom, but they differ greatly in kind and in what must be done about them. Teachers dealing with children whose deviations are those typical of immaturity have no serious problem in meeting children's needs. Deviations one finds in the speech of young children from favored language environments are often the result of greater consistency than the language allows. The child who says, "Look what I brang you! I runned and runned so I wouldn't be late. My picture is more better than his," is practicing a consistency not found in English. Such deviation soon disappears as the result of example and suggestion.

It is the type of deviation represented by Mr. Quirk's first example, what I call the "Me and him ain't got none" kind of English, that presents the greatest challenge to the conscientious teacher who is often overwhelmed by the immensity of her task of helping children even approach the level of acceptable English usage. Articulation of sounds, enunciation, and pronunciation, as well as syntax, all deviate from what the teacher has learned to consider correct.

It is often true, however, that the portion of a child's language which violates the teacher's trained ear is a relatively small proportion of his total language. Yet in the teacher's judgment the portion that is unacceptable overshadows the rest. Most elementary teachers have been trained to think of the channel of grammatical correctness as a narrow one in which every individual must be taught to stay close to the center line. The teacher who practices more regard for the manner than the content of the child's message frequently dries up the flow of speech to the point where she has little or nothing to work with.

Children are aware of major deviance in patterns of sound and in structure of sentences. Example 3 in Mr. Quirk's list, "Little a boy the ran street up," would cause great amusement in any group of six-year-olds. They can distinguish what is clearly nonsentence but are inclined to categorize as nonsentence any pattern sounding strange to their ears.

On the other hand, they can follow patterns such as are found among Chomsky's kernel sentences and can generate other sentences that fit the patterns. Teachers who have worked with sentence patterns find them fruitful in helping children to construct sentences that are grammatically acceptable and also clear and meaningful to their creators. To be valuable, this must never degenerate to routine drill but always be kept on the level of exploration and creative enterprise.

Children enjoy playing with language. Jespersen remarked a number of years ago, "We must then never forget that the organs of speech besides serving for the conveyance of thought, and before they begin to be used for that purpose, are one of mankind's most treasured toys, and that not only children but also grown people, in civilized as well as savage communities, find amusement in letting their vocal cords and tongue and lips play all sorts of games."[1] Likewise, Urban of Yale, in a philosophic treatise on language, called interest in language "one of the oldest and most constant preoccupations of man."[2] Unfortunately, we make little use of this wealth of capital and rarely allow it to earn the dividends it might earn if we put it to work.

A number of teachers have found that children respond happily to the plan of cutting a sentence down to its bare subject and predicate, building about this core or nucleus movables of time, place, manner, cause, and the like. To illustrate with the easiest of examples, children enjoy elements that describe *what, when, where, why,* and possibly *how* to a nucleus such as "Mary ate," "John made," or "Mother bought." Experience with expanding sentences develops interest in the process of generating sentences as well as in what can be achieved through attention to order and organization. Again, this must be done with children's own sentences which serve their personal interests rather than textbook sentences.

The studies of children's language carried out by Walter Loban in California, Kellogg Hunt in Florida, and our own at Indiana University all indicate that the most accurate measure of a child's language maturity and power in the use of it is his ability to expand and elaborate sentences. Our studies show that children utilize all types of sentences as they find need for them, though all children profit from help to extend and refine their skill.

---

[1] Wilbur M. Urban, ***Language and Reality*** (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939), p. 22.

[2] Otto Jespersen, ***Mankind, Nation and Individual from a Linguistic Point of View*** (London: Allen & Unwin, Ltd., 1946), p. 8.

The work of Mr. Quirk in England in studying the response of educated people to various kinds of deviance in sentences could well be replicated here. Teachers who work with culturally deprived children need to learn which types of deviance will most handicap children in later life and therefore which should be given the most concentrated attention. Lacking this, the usual refuge of many teachers in this dilemma is the grammar exercises in textbooks. American textbooks are either resource or strait jacket for our teachers depending upon the philosophy which underlies their use and upon the basic security of the teacher. Some textbooks present grammar so abstractly as to render it valueless to children for either their speech or their writing. Curriculum guides or textbooks which encourage the teacher to make her own independent study of the individual problems in her class tend to set her on a realistic course. Having surveyed the deviant patterns expressed by the children, the next step is to decide which to attack first. Probably the best available help at this point is presented in the categories of levels of usage listed in Pooley's book, *Teaching English Usage*.[3] This material is helpful but less valuable than the material offered in an intensive study such as Mr. Quirk is conducting.

Hopeful at least is the growing tendency of teachers to recognize that children can more easily be motivated to add to their language than to correct it. The dialects of some children deviate so completely from what is called informal standard English that the standard patterns constitute almost a foreign language and need to be taught as such. Even children whose language deviance presents fewer problems can be encouraged to add and to practice language of at least the level of the "network English" of our most popular news analysts and the newspapers.

A number of schools, some aided by funds provided by Title III of the National Defense Education Act, have established listening centers in all primary grade classrooms. At the listening table, children who hear little except substandard English in their out-of-school experience can use available time in school for listening through headphones to standard English tapes or disks, played on instruments which they can learn to manipulate. The recordings offer literature and substantive material on various subjects suitable for the group as well as informal conversational material. Probably this is more valuable for many children than much of the paperwork that could be assigned.

---

[3] Robert C. Pooley, *Teaching English Usage* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1946), pp. 16-24.

The value of literature as an avenue to language improvement is recognized by some of our teachers, but far too few of them. At best, the language of the home, the neighborhood, and the school is practical workaday English. Only through literature can children learn the potentialities of their language and what words and combinations of words can do to and for people through stimulating them to conjure up mental pictures, to react emotionally in sympathy and appreciation, or to spring into action. Teachers who make it a daily practice to share the best in literature with children find evidence of the value of their efforts in the children's speech and writing.

A weakness of our language program is our failure to teach children about language and its influence on history and current human affairs. Children would be interested in the relationship of language to facets of American history and in the present unfolding nature of English both here and around the world. Some effort has been made in this direction, but a great deal more is needed.

Discussion on the Teaching of Language

Recurring themes in the discussion concerned the need for (1) more basic linguistic research, (2) more extended linguistic investigation aimed at particular pedagogical problems, and (3) more intelligent and sophisticated teaching practice based on what research already has made clear. The need for basic research is heightened by the increasing awareness of gaps left by prior studies: traditional linguistic geography has provided too little information on social deviance; sociological studies, like that on Middletown, have given scant attention to linguistic variance. Teachers, meanwhile, attempt to change usage, particularly among underprivileged children, without knowing what the priorities should be or what distinguishes socially significant variants from mere regional differences that come to light in a highly mobile population.

Again and again, reference was made to the disposition of young children to "play" with the language, to enjoy language activities that have some characteristics of games, even to make up language games of their own. Frequently mentioned by participants was the failure of schools and teachers to capitalize on this potential in their approach either to altering usage habits or to introducing new usage patterns. Indeed, some school programs place a higher premium on "correct" usage than on effective communication.

Concerned about developmental patterns in language acquisitions, the participants considered the following topics without general agreement or conclusion: Randolph Quirk contended that lexical organization must precede grammatical organization. Albert Marckwardt observed in reading collected "camp letters" from children that as late as the fifth grade many children are writing as they speak, but by the seventh grade their writing shows a marked difference from their speech; for example, letters from more mature children show less use of coordination in endlessly run-on sentences and a greater tendency toward at least a degree of subordination. Mr. Marckwardt said that no one knows, yet, what pedagogical and developmental factors underlie this conversion. Frederick Cassidy suggested that a "beatnik" phase may be as characteristic of an adolescent's speech as it is of his dress. The assignment by the adolescent of genuine importance to a straightened tie or "straightened" speech will often be far more effective in producing change than exhortation or prescription.

Teaching Written and Oral English in Nonselective Secondary Schools

William T. Spouge

Since I can refer to myself as an ordinary teacher of ordinary children, you will see that I have limited my presentation to comments on nonselective schools—which, in England, are schools for children who have not been selected to go elsewhere. My experience has always been with boys and girls of eleven to fifteen plus in that 60 percent or so of our secondary population that has not been segregated at eleven from their companions of the previous six years and moved into an elite society to receive an academic education suitable to their aptitudes and abilities.

I have used the word "elite" because selection for a grammar school tends to maintain (or confer) a feeling of superior social status, and relegation to a secondary modern school tends to maintain (or confer) a very strong social devaluation. This separation is very undesirable, not to say wildly unrealistic in our increasingly mobile and iconoclastic society, and I believe that it is the teacher of the mother tongue who must have a particular care in unifying society, because he of all teachers is in the best position to do so. His material is any and everything that interests and involves his pupils (or should be), and his principal media are the spoken and written word of the common language. That I can do only half a job is a pity. I do not want to give the impression that only secondary modern teachers recognize the problems and have all the answers; instead, I am looking at modern developments in English teaching in the context of my own school and experience.

My school is eighty years old and is in what you would call the downtown part of a northern industrial town. There are 550 boys and girls, mostly living near the school, mostly destined to follow their parents into the woolen mills and engineering factories, and if you recall Professor Hoggart's description of a working class neighborhood in *The Uses of Literacy* or known the paintings of L. S. Lowry, you will have a fair idea of what my school is like. Most of the children will stay at school more or less willingly until they are fifteen (the legal departure age), but an increasing number are staying on to take public examinations, and we hope we can educate them at the same time.

Our society seems rather undemanding in the education we give to its children in English. People will say vaguely that they expect them to be well spoken, capable of producing properly punctuated letters, impeccably spelled and correctly addressed. These are the ideal qualifications of a junior clerk. How much better it would be if society demanded attention to the role of language in the growth and development of personality, in the awareness of personal uniqueness and human relationships. This I take to be the purpose of education. But society does not, which means we must persist in supplying the goods it *really* needs, as a fringe benefit, providing model employees—for model employers.

If I deal with written English first, it is because it has long been the major preoccupation of teachers, presumably because all children talk anyway but need to be taught to write. And there has been too much attention given to the mechanical problems of writing; to the manipulation of fragments of the language remote from context; the mastery of techniques, terms, and forms irrespective of the value of content and its relevance to children; and a concentration on those aspects of written English that can be reliably examined, to the detriment of those that cannot. Of course, mechanical accuracy is desirable, but relevance and involvement come first. A boy does not expect to spend a year in the woodwork room sharpening chisels and setting a plane.

So our first concern is to prepare children to write, to help them with sources for composition and material that invites re-writing, in his personal attitudes and considered opinion. Once convinced of this interest, he will be prepared to believe that we are bothered about faulty spelling, grammatical errors, and bad writing only because they obscure meaning and obstruct the reader. If the teacher is genuine, the child will believe that what he writes matters, and writing will progress. The most important factor in language teaching is the absolute sincerity of the teacher's interest in his children as people, because he cannot teach the language in isolation when all his material must be sought in the common heritage.

What are the simplest sources? Experiences of home, pets, parents, holidays, friends, and the neighborhood are, with young children, tangible and immediate themes. But there are feelings, too: fear, shyness, a bad conscience. One of my colleagues told me of confessing to thirteen-year-olds that he had once put a penny in a chocolate machine and thirty bars fell out. He shared them with his pals at school and had the fright of his life when he went home and saw a tall stranger talking to his parents. When he was brought out of the bathroom, where he had gone to hide, prison bars looming before him, the whole story poured out. One can imagine how this story succeeded with the class. Did it diminish his "authority"? It released a flood of joyfully written confessions and eventually a fair discussion of conscience and fear of punishment.

It is impossible to separate *writing* from talking and listening, as well as reading, for we are learning more and more that almost all personal and social development is through talk, which can be immensely helped by the use of literature. Whole areas of experience with which children are already familiar, and of which they are becoming aware as they grow to maturity, are accessible in literature, transformed from fleeting, hesitant, ill-formed, and confused impressions to ordered universal reality. Is not one of the pleasures of reading with children seeing their recognition of a personal experience? I wish I could find parallels in literature for the infinite concerns of my pupils, for they give lead and structure to the children's own writing. This need is too often ignored; a composition, essay, theme, continuous writing—whatever we call it—is the most difficult task we demand of children, for which we often provide the least help: "Write two sides on 'An Empty House.' You've got a double period, no need to hurry." Is it not better to read "The Barn" by Edmund Blunden: "Rain-sunken roofs grown green and thin for sparrows' nests and starlings' nests . . ." and *talk* about old buildings, tumbledown buildings, local buildings? Examine the poet's movement about the barn and his reflections on its inhabitants and visitors. Then think about writing.

Do you know the description of the Badger's kitchen in *The Wind in the Willows* by Kenneth Grahame? It is rather unfashionable these days. But I never forgot those winking copper pans, the fire, the settles, and redbrick floor, the shuffling of the Badger's slippers, and the warmth of our own kitchen in winter.

What about childhood disasters? For example, "Child on Top of a Greenhouse" by Theodore Roethke:

> The wind billowing out of the seat of my britches
> My feet crackling splinters of glass and dried putty,
> The half-grown chrysanthemums staring up like accusers. . . .[1]

. . . or life with a house-proud mother. A short story from *The Go-Away Bird* by Muriel Spark depicts sharply the spiritual poverty of an ultrahygienic home and an adolescent girl's confusion at the conflict of her values with those of a doctor and his wife (socially superior) who have befriended her. My classes will not discuss this story, usually because too many shafts go home, but it has been good for some keen dialogue in the adolescent-parent confrontation.

Sometimes a passage may be presented "cold" to see what kind of response it will promote; for example, the description of the horse from the Book of Job: "Hast thou given the horse strength. . . ." Young children turn out jousting knights in armor, but more than once, the seniors have led me into a topic I have wanted to discuss, but hesitated to raise myself, because it tends to put up the barriers between young people and the sermonizing adult. This is the general theme of youth and violence. On several occasions, boys have seen an immediate parallel with young leather-jacketed motorcyclists—the "ton-up boys" who try to reach 100 m.p.h. among traffic on the highways. Two are worth quoting in full:

> Have you given his bike strength?

and:

> I speed.
>
> do.

There is a similarity here to Thom Gunn's poem "On the Move" which these boys had not read at the time.

Here is a boy with insight into a girl's feelings:

> He does the ton for the twentieth time,
> His girl-friend says he must not go again.

---

[1] Theodore Roethke, *The Lost Son and Other Poems* (Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1948), p. 22.

> He agrees and has done the ton
> for the last time.

This is entirely true and echoes the conclusion of *A Clockwork Orange* by Anthony Burgess, a book I recommend to any teacher who may not know it.

There is a quotation from *The Grapes of Wrath* from that most moving and evocative campfire scene: "I'm gonna take care my kids don't miss no more school. I can read good, but it ain't no pleasure to me like with a fellow that's used to it."

Reading of the kind he means and the kind we mean is more than a pleasure; it is a way to a fuller life, for it gives children the immense satisfaction of identifying themselves and their condition with universal human situations and concerns, observed and ordered by masters of the craft that they have still to learn.

Here I find myself moving into oral work to look at another stimulus to writing. This work may spread over several lessons, and the final pieces of writing may be impossible to compare and assess. But there is no reason to doubt its value. Record the Balcony Scene and a brief extract from Act III, Scene II of *Romeo and Juliet:*

> Come night, come Romeo, come thou day in night.

This is with fourth and fifth year children (how old was Juliet?) and, though delicate stuff to handle, it might help them to cope with the intensity and tumultuous dottiness of adolescent love.

Include with this a reading of the meeting of Edward and Rose from *They Walk in the City* by J. B. Priestley. This is love at first sight, shyness, clumsiness, the tentative approach, and complicated social awkwardness that is very relevant to my pupils:

> Edward says: "I live in Halliford, too. Always have done. Sutcliffe Place. Know it?"
> "Yes." She looked at him, smiled faintly, coloured a little.
> "Where do you live?" he demanded, almost sternly.
> She hesitated a tiny moment. "Slater Street," she replied.
> He was rather surprised. He knew Slater Street and she did not look at all like Slater Street.[2]

Many of my pupils live in Slater Street, too, and know the difficulties.

Tolstoy's *Childhood, Boyhood, Youth* has a very amusing short section on "Affairs of the Heart." It causes the girls to giggle and evokes a mixed response of guffaws and blushes from the boys.

---

[2] J. B. Priestley, *They Walk in the City* (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1936), p. 93.

These extracts, and poems like "The Shy Lover" by John Clare, direct the classes to examine the states of mind of participants in these painful occasions. And of course, personal background material is abundant. The kind of writing I received from all this varies. Dialogue is well observed and organized, narrative clumsy, but in very many instances the quality of content is far higher than what is found in the teenage girls' magazines. I think we may fairly say that it is a subject relevant to the lives and interests of the children.

We can improvise drama, write plays (you will know how often little boys' plays require a scuffle on the floor), and examine important problems such as how easily a quarrel can result from misunderstanding by looking at the quarrel between Brutus and Cassius. If we are considering the manipulation of men's minds, perhaps in advertising, perhaps in political propaganda, it would seem obvious to look at Mark Antony's handling of the mob after the death of Caesar.

These, and other passages which will come to your minds, stimulate personal writing because they deal superbly with important human problems that children are aware of but need help in solving.

It can be seen, too, that a similar use of literature will stimulate personal response to good writing; not literary appreciation, not "comprehension," but an exploration of the rapport between a child's personal experience and his vicarious experience through reading or listening to literature. I quote: "The best book I have read is *A Tale of Two Cities* by Charles Dickens. There is a lawyer who is a failure and an alcoholic. He loves a girl, but she married somebody else and he drank more. Later he decides to make some good of his wasted life, so he swops places with the husband in the Bastille because he was going to be executed for his title. I think it is the most generous thing you can do to sacrifice yourself for someone else's happiness." This is not bad for a nonselected boy of thirteen, and we will have him for another two years.

We do not neglect the traditional skills; summary is important (see above) and we manipulate information, statistics, oral reports; we make notes and write notices. We do write letters, and they do obey the conventions, but we are more concerned with humane considerations of social intercourse than with complaining about refrigerators or applying for jobs. And if the raw material is seen to be relevant to their interests (children are much more serious than some of their elders sometimes suppose), then it seems that mechanical errors do not overburden the text and what is most important, we have created conditions where the correction of errors, questions of style, etc., can be dealt with realistically as the need arises and when the incentive is genuine. For example, spelling: a permanent list of diehards may be displayed in the class, correcting them by reference when needed. A topic common to the class will probably reveal that about one fifth of the class commits the same mistakes. Collecting examples and dealing with them on the board, briefly, is one possible solution; for the rest, private reading time, even five minutes at registration, is worth any number of spelling lists and devices.

A great amount of work has concerned the teaching of vocabulary—not lists of "homoantosynonyms" but actual experience of needing words for a particular occasion that the teacher creates in the classroom or outside. Who can say what hitherto unpracticed ingenuity was liberated in classrooms all over England when that young teacher blew bubbles in front of his class on television. Children handle objects; consider shape, color, texture, size; listen to sounds, look at pictures—all the time experimenting with words in talk before writing. This must be the way. And we have to convince the timid and the sceptic alike that it is not time wasted.

I hope I have said enough about writing to indicate how important we regard it as an aid to personal growth and satisfaction. I have not dealt specifically with the range of ability of our children, which is wide, for our aim is consistent throughout the school: to get them writing about themselves and their world.

Nor have I referred in detail to the use made of films, pictures, discs, tapes, B.B.C. radio programs for schools, and television programs on B.B.C. and independent channels. I hope that it has been implicit in all I have said that teachers who value the freedom to experiment and enlarge the scope of their work in English will use them if they wish, though I cannot say that they are available in sufficient quantity in all our schools.

Let me quote lastly a boy's response to poetry that defies assessment in the usual terms: a fifteen-year-old tough listened to me reading "Flying Crooked" by Robert Graves, which contrasts the erratic flight of a butterfly with the graceful flight of a swift. He borrowed the book, copied down the poem laboriously and very neatly, and drew two lines through the script—one wayward and uncertain, the other a quite graceful flourish. He brought out his book and said: "That's how it is, isn't it?" He has not stayed on to take examinations.

On the whole, our attention to speaking and talking in school has been small, and yet, to quote from the Newsom Report: "There is no gift like the gift of speech, and the level at which children have learned to use it determines the level of their companionship and the level at which their life is lived."[3] They have been neglected because there is a tradition of written examinations—themselves concerned with limited skills—that has diverted teachers from the fact that for normal children in normal circumstances outside the classroom, most communication and learning is by the spoken language. But there is welcome change taking place throughout England, and we can hope that soon a lot more attention will be given to effective communication through the spoken word. It is good that a child should be literate, but it is better that he should be *orate* (which is Andrew Wilkinson's word). An orate person is one able to use the oral skills of *speaking* and *listening*. He is not necessarily the same as our "well-spoken" young clerk. He is skilled in what Dr. Wilkinson calls Reciprocal Speech: ". . . the creative utterance which is necessary . . . when we speak with individuals or small groups in varying situations, and they respond: thus the speaker creates not only his own utterance, but to some extent, the utterance of the listener. Formal speech (that intended for an audience) may have its place, but this Reciprocal Speech is the staple of our communion, person to person." So teaching oracy needs more than a lesson in the timetable labeled Speech Training. And when you reflect how many of the difficulties of "difficult" children have their origin in oral inadequacies—not necessarily physical defects, but social and emotional, you will say that the teacher of English has a very special care. Opportunities for speaking, listening, and reply must be provided in every English lesson. In a way, they are the interrelation and interaction of reading, writing, and talking which have been implicit in my talk, but there is much more to it than the teacher talking, asking questions, and receiving answers. The kind of activities that will promote oracy are those which require the teacher to seem to participate rather than to seem to guide or direct—small discussion groups, short prepared talks (own choice wherever possible), and informal conversation suggest themselves—and there is a definite place for the prepared reading for the enjoyment of a group. *Reading and Talking in English* by Arthur Wise shows how exercise can be combined with pleasure, and it reminds us that listening is just as positive as talking.

---

[3] Ministry of Education, *Half Our Future*. A Report of the Central Advisory Council for Education (England), John Newsom, Chairman (London: Her Majesty's Stationary Office, 1963), p. 118.

Oracy involves discrimination in listening, which is much more than an ability to understand the "meaning of the words"; there is the significance of the context, of the speaker himself, his personality, the quality of his voice, intonation, emphasis, even gesture. A fifth-form girl chose to read "Beauty Never Visits Mining Places" by F. C. Boden. It can be read effectively enough with easily assumed indignation, but in the final verse —"Playing in the slag with their white faces / Where headstocks loom by the railway lines / Round-eyed children cheated of life's graces / My fellows' children born for the mines,"—she spoke with a bitterness and anger that surprised her group, and I think, herself. Some time later, she put me firmly in my place for suggesting that the Girl Guides were out of date, very competently outlined the qualities of a good Guide leader, and ended up by a very funny account of how she had gained the cook badge with a meal of potato soup, fruit jelly, and rock cakes—and the rock cakes sank. I think that girl was orate, and the pleasant thing is that I cannot remember teaching oracy to her or her class. I can remember much pleasant conversation, heated discussions, and the day when I was the third consecutive teacher to harangue them on their failings. Talk about utterance creating its listener's response—they would not speak to me during the whole lesson.

In a limited way, we do teach certain skills and try to correct by good example rather than by personal criticism, but our real contribution to education through talking is in providing the stimuli and the right physical conditons in the classroom: informal seating if possible, small space for acting; books, magazines, gramophone, and tape recorder. The last is essential. We can read aloud, act or record a part of a play, recount experiences, practice social situations like introductions and interviews, or just talk. The teacher has to strike a nice balance between genuine participation and control; difficult indeed; the skill required is an orate one. And again, just as in writing, what really matters is the ability to convince the children that you are genuinely interested in what they have to say and that you are ready to learn from them if they are more expert than you on a subject. It is perhaps facile to say that you should like children, but it is essential for our work that we value them as unique persons. We must prove by our attitude that we respect their considered opinion and their careful judgments, their preferences and their work. Of all our work, that to do with oral education has surely the greatest possibilities for good.

And again, I find I have an English activity that is not just oral English. We have a teacher of modern dance who finds children as inhibited in movement as we find them in speech. Since there is this common interest we sometimes work together. We look for poems that suggest dance movements and patterns. The English teachers familiarize the girls with the poem a short time before they are to dance it, and they also choose the speakers who will record it. Later, when the girls are dancing the "Cataract of Lodore," John Clare's "Description of a Thunderstorm," or "In Just—," by e. e. cummings (and there is a poem that dances off the page), I wonder what progress in English I have achieved with them. In literacy? In oracy? It does not worry me very much.

At the beginning of the paper, I stated that some of our children stayed on to take public examinations. This has been happening in nonselective schools for a long time, and it may be surprising to know that many of these "nonselected" children have been prepared for and passed the examination they were not fit to go to the other school for. I have prepared "nonselective" children for these examinations, but I do not now. For a lot of teachers have known for a long time that these exams do not really examine some of the things that mattered most in English, that they do provide essential information on a candidate's total ability, and that they do not tend to have a bad effect on classroom teaching.

There is a new examination, the Certificate of Secondary Education, intended roughly for the 80th-40th percentile of the ability range which started this year. It may suffer from precisely similar faults, but some of us hope it will have an enormous effect on the traditional patterns of English teachers by relating the examination room more closely to the classroom, and the classroom more closely to life outside. I will mention its most important points as they concern the teaching of English: first—the examining boards are regional and their subject panels are composed of serving teachers. The teachers are specifically responsible for syllabuses and papers, are expected to inform their local colleagues of progress and developments, and to receive and consider representations concerned with the examining of the subject. So, there is teacher participation to some purpose.

Second—this means that the conduct of the examination is more likely to reflect classroom practice than has been possible before; for example, not only may dictionaries and prescribed texts be used, but the total content of the papers may be expected to encourage personal involvement in the ways I have suggested earlier.

The survey of syllabuses and specimen papers published by NATE last summer is most encouraging. Every board except one regards English as a single subject; every board includes some form of oral examination or assessment, most boards require course work, and enough boards permit reference books and prescribed texts in the examination room to encourage us to hope that this habit spreads.

The two great steps, then, are English as a single subject and the inclusion of oral examination. If we do not yet know how to assess oral English, at least we want to give it official recognition, and there is no surer way than by examining it. The influence of the exam on the classroom can be beneficial here.

In the written papers, nearly everyone has thrown away isolated tests of bits and pieces—hunt the simile, correct the examiner's punctuation and his willful abuse of language. There are excellent attempts to stimulate continuous writing, recognition of the importance of personal involvement, a realistic sense of children's interests, innovations in providing stimuli: one board allows its candidates to see, handle, and discuss objects just before the examination, others supply uncaptioned pictures, and there is care that adequate time be allowed for unhurried work.

While not intending to look closely at the proposals for examining literature, which is widely and rightly interpreted to mean the candidate's response to literature, I am impressed by the wide variety of books being offered, and, fortunately, my own regional board will permit me to read what I like with my pupils because they can answer questions on unseen passages if they do not want to tackle set-books. There is no doubt that this new exam can have a liberating and revivifying effect on classroom teaching. But there are still dangers; papers can become stereotyped, questions predictable, textbooks made-to-measure. The price as usual will be eternal vigilance.

In its section for teachers who wish to submit their own syllabuses and papers for C.S.E. (we can if we wish), the NATE Survey suggests suitable activities for oral assessment. I shall quote some because they tie up the theme of this paper quite neatly:

> The best tests will be those where the discussion is relaxed and friendly.
>
> Informal prepared talks followed by question and discussion give a pupil authority and status.
>
> Conversation between teacher and pupil is welcome as much for its encouragement of friendly relationships as for its effectiveness as a natural test of spoken English.

These are suggestions for an examination which are, of course, quite normal classroom activities. Are they so very different from speaking situations outside the classroom and school?

So long as society wants to label its products, I suppose we shall have to put up with examinations. But I should not mind very much if what I do in the classroom has a limiting effect on the papers.

But I do not want to finish by commenting on examinations.

At the end of last term one of my pupils gave me some poems. They were not done in class; I had not asked for them. She is not a very clever girl, but then, if she had been she would not have been at our school.

AS THE DOORS OPEN

As the Doors begin to open
The pilot begins to sigh,
And the people living on the ground
Begin to learn to die.

It is the girl who told me about the rock cakes. I wonder if her school has helped her to learn to live?

Teaching Oral and Written English in the United States

J. N. Hook

In preparing these comments, I was faced with the question of whether to describe what seem to be "best" practices in teaching oral and written English in the United States or to content myself with "typical" practices. I decided to concentrate on those which appear best, while freely admitting that it would be difficult to point to large numbers of schools that conform to all the best practices.

In a well-run school system, our children get very early and very extensive opportunity to speak in the classroom. The old-time conception of a schoolroom as a place where no child may speak until he is spoken to has largely vanished. Little tots in kindergarten or first grade take part in the almost universal "show and tell" sessions; they work and talk together in their little group projects; they listen attentively to stories and react with bubbling excitement when the teacher pauses to ask a question: "What do you think Jojo will do now? What would you do if you were in Jojo's place?"

The stories these young children are exposed to are not literary masterpieces, but they do have sound literary merit on a child's level. They are imaginative and at the same time informative. Today they are much less prosaic and dull than the former diet of *Chickie the Chicken* and *Our Friend the Farmer.* Poetry with marked rhythm and obvious rhymes is often included. Such reading has almost immediate impact on children's writing. Children of average ability in the university of Nebraska Curriculum Study Center, which stresses reading of imaginative works, are writing one-hundred- to two-hundred-word stories of their own after only five or six months in the first grade—stories very different from the "I see a dog" that too often has represented the highest level of expectation.

As children move up through the grades, opportunities to speak and write continue to be frequent. The subject matter now widens. Narratives still occupy the most prominent place, but pupils also write about their science experiments, social studies, art, music, games—the whole wide range of the elementary curriculum. Teaching of the mechanics of writing is largely incidental, except that drill on spelling occupies direct attention in every grade up to seven or eight or possibly above. The teacher chooses appropriate spots for other instruction in mechanics. For example, when the children are writing a conversation, she demonstrates the use of quotation marks. Or when a bright boy or girl is struggling to express a thought in a sentence form that he has seldom attempted, she helps him with the clue he needs. But the emphasis throughout is on content: helping the children to realize what they have to say, or as Mr. Spouge phrases it, helping them "with sources for composition and material that invites response."

When the children have been in school for six to eight years, the task of teaching writing and speaking changes gradually and subtly. By this time they have, relatively speaking, a considerable fund of knowledge about an amazing variety of subjects. The problem at this time and throughout the high school years and on into college becomes in part a matter of helping the students to see relationships among the parts of their knowledge, in other words, to organize. Beyond that, it involves interpretation: when this information is placed with this, what logical conclusions can be drawn? Naturally the process of adding to the information never ceases: the students read extensively; they learn from television, radio, movies, personal experiences, teachers, parents, and one another. But now the schools, and especially the teachers of English, are assisting them in conducting the lifelong search for meaning, for significance, for conclusions. This is no sudden change; the good elementary teachers do much more than pour in information. But it is a gradual shift in emphasis.

In grades seven to nine, much attention is given to this search for meaning, for putting things together in organized fashion. The paragraph receives much stress, because it is a composition in miniature, and through it the various patterns for organizing thoughts can be demonstrated. Students sometimes work out sample paragraphs together, in class, and they write paragraphs as individuals. They are led to realize that a paragraph requires concentration on one subject: one is unlikely to write about soybeans and the Empire State Building in a single paragraph. They learn that writing is inevitably a process of constant selection, that since it is impossible to write everything about, for instance, the causes of automobile accidents, the writer must know what is the chief thing he wants to say about the subject and then select the details—the evidence—needed to bolster what he has to say. Students learn, too, that a paragraph has a logical flow. When a writer puts down his first sentence, as Francis Christensen has pointed out, he makes a commitment. His first sentence restricts the number of possibilities for his second sentence; the writer has signaled the reader, telling him in general the kind of thing he can expect next. The second sentence is a signal in its turn, and so on, as the well-constructed paragraph moves inexorably to an inevitable conclusion.

To digress for a moment, what I have just said calls attention to the increasing respect being paid in American schools and colleges to rhetoric. Scholars, teachers, and college students are going back for a fresh look at Plato, Aristotle, Quintilian, and Cicero, and at the eighteenth century British rhetoricians; they are reading Kenneth Burke, applicable parts of I. A. Richards, and other twentieth century figures. Some scholars are developing new or revised rhetorical concepts particularly relevant to writing modern English; they make use of findings in semantics, criticism, and psycholinguistics. This kind of study is filtering slowly down to other educational levels, where it is simplified into classroom terms.

In the senior high school, the process of helping students to organize their thoughts continues. Compositions are typically of several paragraphs. The subject matter for composition slowly changes. The emphasis shifts from personal experience and observation to the relatively impersonal. More of the writing is related to the literature the students are reading, though scientific, sociological, and other topics are not excluded. We make less use of précis writing than do our British friends, and the amount of creative writing (poetry, short stories, and the like) varies from school to school. In the 1930's we were on a creative writing binge, with too little attention to organization and mechanics. The reaction in favor of exposition probably went too far, but now good schools are striving for the inclusion of at least those parts of creative writing that may contribute to excellence in exposition.

Throughout their elementary and secondary school years, students develop writing and speaking skills at different rates. The problem of individual differences is perhaps insoluble, as the gulf constantly widens between the able and the slow. Good teachers, though, attempt to take each child where he is when they get him and help him to progress as far as he can beyond that point. Some modern techniques are specifically designed to attack the problem: ability grouping of students, team teaching, programed instruction, individual instruction, and others.

Nevertheless, when students leave high school, their levels of achievement vary tremendously. Over half of them go on to further education in junior college, technical school, or four-year college or university. An entering freshman class in a college is likely to be a highly diverse group, and our college English departments have never learned just what they should do with the diversity. As a result, our college freshman English courses (taking the nation as a whole) are lacking in a consistent philosophy. Some stress reading of literature and writing about it; others emphasize linguistics, semantics, sociological readings, mechanics of writing, rhetorical theory, the mass media, or any of a dozen other possible foci for the course. College freshman English is the least satisfactory part of the whole continuum. We spend a hundred million dollars a year on a course without a generally accepted rationale.

The English program before college (remember that I am speaking of good schools) is carefully devised, carefully planned, and is becoming more so. Sequence is one of the magic words of our decade. Science teachers, mathematics teachers, and others—certainly including English teachers—talk knowledgeably about theories of the sequential curriculum, usually with emphasis on the spiral curriculum of Jerome Bruner and others. In good schools, the principles of a sequential curriculum are being increasingly put into practice.

So far, though, we see less sequence in speech instruction than in the teaching of writing. From the relatively free speaking of the children in the lower grades we move toward relatively rigid speaking in the upper schools, with speech work usually confined to class discussion, panel discussion, and an occasional oral report. Many of our high schools have speech departments, but typically only a fourth or a fifth of high school students take courses in speech. Therefore most of the burden of such instruction falls upon the English teacher. As for listening, the other part of "oracy" (a word that I shall cherish), we had a teaching-of-listening fad about fifteen years ago, with scores of professional articles on the subject, but we now pay much less attention to it than we probably should.

My brief overview has left much unsaid. Moreover, since I stressed practices in good schools, I distorted the national picture; thousands of schools do not do as good a job as we know how to do. But I for one am convinced, on the basis of more than thirty years of experience and observation, that we are doing a better job, on the average, than we formerly did. A higher proportion of our students are going on to college, and a higher percentage of that group are closer to literacy today than they were when I began teaching. Progress is slow and painful, but I believe that we are making it. We can learn much from our British and Canadian colleagues, and if there is anything that they can learn from us, we shall be happy to share.

Teaching Writing in Canada

Earl W. Buxton

When approaching the task of relating Mr. Spouge's excellent paper to the teaching of writing in Canada, I must confess I experienced certain misgivings. Some of these misgivings are related to Mr. Spouge's ancestors. When those ancestors signed the British North America Act, granting us Canadians our freedom, they left in it a clause that gave each province complete control over all educational matters. No other provincial power has been more tenaciously held or staunchly guarded for a period that will become one hundred years on July 1, 1967, when we Canadians indulge in whatever revels might be included in the term "Centennial Celebrations." The task of creating some sort of unity among the ten provinces is one which causes the stoutest Canadian prime ministers to develop chills along the spine. Any educator may expect to experience the same feeling of zero at the bone when he attempts to find some national philosophy basic to the teaching of writing in Canada.

Of course, I knew that in most of the curriculum guides for the ten provinces I might find general agreement that students ought to learn to read, write, and speak the English language with a reasonable degree of skill. However, I sensed that even on this objective there might be no unanimity. In one province, a large and very vocal part of the population is doubtful that the English language ought to receive this preferential treatment; a smaller but even more vocal group in that province is doubtful that the *maudit* English language ought to be taught at all.

But let us leave that problem to the Canadian Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism, because it has been allowed two million dollars and unlimited time to reach a solution, while I have been limited to a brief amount of space in which to discuss the teaching of writing in Canada.

As I talked with educators and examined the most recent curriculum guides issued by the various provinces, I found that the expected heterogeneity and disagreement are not evident; there is considerable unanimity in philosophy and objectives. Across Canada there seems to be a growing conviction that teachers are intelligent enough to select materials and to develop procedures that will best meet the needs of their individual classes. There is a growing emphasis upon the fusing of reading, listening, speaking, and writing into organized programs. There is an increasing doubt about the value of traditional grammar and textbook exercises as a means of increasing students' skill in English. In statements ranging from succinct to rhetorical, the curriculum guides emphasize that if a student is to develop writing proficiency, he must be in an environment that stimulates thinking, he must know that he has something to say, he must have a desire to say it, and he must be encouraged and assisted to say it as clearly, as accurately, and as interestingly as possible.

The attention given to these principles suggests to me that if Mr. Spouge were a member of any provincial curriculum committee in Canada, he would find himself in congenial company. He would find that most of the English curriculum committees have objectives similar to those being achieved by the procedures he has so effectively described. In the few minutes at my disposal, I will discuss just three of these objectives.

Mr. Spouge indicated his awareness of our first objective by the things he did not mention. He began by telling us that most of his students were destined to follow their parents into the woolen mills and engineering factories. Having given us this information, he proceeded to ignore the woolen mills, and to tell us how he reads poetry to his students, and then lets the poet stimulate them to talk and write about themselves and their relationships with other people and the world in which they live—not about the factories in which they will work.

In Alberta, during our discussions of General Programs, one representative of the vocational committees expressed his point of view this way:

> When you are designing an English program, you have to think about what these kids will be doing after they leave school. They won't be reading poetry and they won't be involved in personal writing; they need to learn how to read instructions and to write simple reports and letters of application.

Our response has been that we want the study of English to reach beyond preparing students for a job. If English is to be taught only for vocational preparation, then some students will have completed the course when they have learned to say, "Good Morning" to the boss, to read the note the housewife has inserted in the milk bottle, or to select the most appropriate cuss words to use when the crescent wrench slips and they skin their knuckles.

We hope that in their limited time in our schools, these students may develop some understanding of the motives that drive men, as well as the motors that drive cars. We hope that they will have some opportunity to search for the meanings in Shirley Jackson's "The Lottery," to wonder what it is like to stand alone like Dr. Stockman in *An Enemy of the People*, or to think about the character traits and the forces that might cause reasonably sane men to engage in the kind of mob violence described in *The Ox-Bow Incident*.

I find it interesting that most curriculum guides across Canada provide a more varied and flexible program for the general students than they do for those in the matriculation pattern. In the General Programs, teachers are given freedom to select from lists of suggested materials which include poetry, short stories, essays, autobiographies, and Shakespearian and modern plays. The word *paperbacks* appears repeatedly, and there is frequent reference to such books as *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn; The Diary of Anne Frank; The Pearl; Shane; The OX-Bow Incident; Cry, the Beloved Country;* and *The Old Man and the Sea.*

Related to this matter of freedom and flexibility is a second objective—that of reconciling two apparently contradictory aspects of the English teacher's task.

On the one hand, we want to be certain that the student's writing is exemplary of his best capabilities. Not only must he have something to say and the desire to say it; he must be prepared to subject his initial draft to careful revision. With the large student loads that English teachers are carrying, we cannot afford to waste valuable time pointing out weaknesses that the student could have eliminated himself. After he has used the labor of the file, we may help him to develop increased skill. We may be able to promote this development by reading carefully what he has written, reacting to what he has to say, and suggesting how he might have achieved even greater accuracy, clarity, or interest. That is, we believe that progress in learning to write may require sustained student effort and frank teacher criticism.

On the other hand, we want the student to find writing a stimulating experience and not a traumatic ordeal. We do not want him to view his teacher as one who asks him to write and then seems intent on showing him that he knows nothing about writing. We do not want his efforts inhibited by the feeling that writing is something like Bunyan's highway to the Celestial City with "a ditch on one hand, a quagmire on the other, and the road so full of pits, pitfalls, deep holes, and shelving that few dared travel it."

It seems to me that Mr. Spouge has resolved this dilemma by letting his students know he is on their side. They are anxious to avoid any errors that will create difficulty for the reader who has shown them that he is sincerely interested in what they have to say.

Mr. Spouge's emphasis upon the importance of stimulating discussion as a basis for writing is reiterated in a number of curriculum guides across Canada. The principle also receives support in Merron Chorny's recent comprehensive survey of the teaching of composition in Alberta schools.[1] The majority of the teachers participating in Chorny's study stated that the topics producing the most successful writing were those which engaged the knowledge of the student, those which resulted from vigorous and sometimes controversial class discussion, and those which allowed the student to be original and creative.

Experiments by a number of teachers in Edmonton indicate that at times it may be wise for us to let the student know how ignorant we are about subjects on which he is very knowledgeable. One of these subjects is *himself*, but there are others related to his interests and his hobbies: What is the meaning of a football referee's signals? How do you raise tropical fish?

One Alberta teacher, having just completed a series of driving lessons prior to receiving a license, said to her class of "shop" boys, "I want to buy a good used car, but I hear that this is a risky business. Write an explanation of what I ought to do, what I ought to watch for, so that I won't get cheated." She told me that she not only received some of the best compositions that the class had written, but also an unexpected bonus.

---

[1] Merron Chorny, "A Survey of Teaching Procedures in the English Language Programs of Grades IX, XI, XII in Alberta Schools" (Doctoral dissertation: University of Alberta, 1965).

Three of the boys came to her and said, "We'd like you to come down to Sad Sam's with us and look at a Chev. there. It's in good shape. He wanted $800 for it, but we've talked him down to $690. We think it's a good buy."

In short, though learning to write is a serious business that demands sustained effort and attention, it need not be a tedious series of themes to be written so that a teacher can "correct" them. Language classes need not be dull; there is a place for variety and for humor. Even a youngster's struggles with language can have their lighter moments.

A friend's son was doing his English assignment when his father, happening to glance over the boy's shoulder, saw him faced with the task of writing the antonym for each word in a list. One of the words was *malevolent,* and Jerry had provided the answer. The antonym for *malevolent* is *female volent.*

A third objective is to help the student absorb a knowledge of the language elements which provide a basis for speaking and writing. We keep asking students to use more effective words, to achieve greater sentence variety, to organize and present ideas in an interesting way. But to produce this kind of writing, the student must have had many experiences with words. He must have heard them and seen them again and again in various contexts and in different combinations. He must be continually meeting in his reading the English sentence in all its infinite variety. If a student is a nonreader, and if his exposure to effective spoken English is limited, asking him for a more mature level in his writing may be like asking him to build an attractive bungalow with a few rusty nails and some scrap lumber; we will be frustrated when he produces only a shanty.

Some recent research seems to support our conviction that a student's *output* in the form of effective speech and writing depends to a considerable degree on the *input* that comes from hearing and reading the language. I note that for this reason, among others, most of the provincial guides emphasize that the student should be encouraged to read widely. The British Columbia program is unequivocal in its statement that:

> The best way to teach writing is to encourage the habit of reading so that the student may have a background of ideas; and the practice of writing so that he may be able to express his thoughts.

In Alberta, we have been introducing developmental reading programs in the secondary schools and urging administrators to encourage the teachers of all subjects to give increased attention to reading.

Beyond this, we can help the student to see what good writers do when they select and organize words to express thought. If students are encouraged to discuss the content and structure of personal essays, interesting autobiographies, or even effective student themes, they may learn much about the techniques of effective writing. For example, how does Churchill use concrete details to describe his first confrontation with *mensa*, a table, in "a greeny covered Latin book" when he was seven years old? How does Lincoln Steffens avoid a mere cataloguing of incidents as he tells us how he trained his colt? What techniques does Sandburg use in *Always the Young Strangers* to add vitality to his description of such mundane jobs as sweeping out the barber shop or driving a milk wagon?

In addition to helping the student to increase his skill in using language, literature may stimulate his interest in learning *about* his language. Curriculum guides for British Columbia and Alberta suggest references and procedures which teachers can use to help students develop some understanding of *etymology, structural grammar, semantics,* and *varieties of English usage.*

In the General Programs, these studies need not become too formal or involved. For example, a simple word like *crafty,* used to describe an individual, presents a value judgment and may initiate a discussion of semantics. *Crafty* is also interesting in terms of both structure and etymology. Structurally, it carries the derivational affix{-y}which is used to change numerous words that function as nouns into adjectives. Thinking only of those that refer to parts of the body, students can suggest *hairy, brainy, toothy, hearty, sinewy, bloody, cheeky, nosy,* and *mouthy.* Etymologically, *crafty* is an example of *degradation:* it now connotes deception; it was once a term of commendation, meaning skilled at one's craft.

Words like *nosy* and *cheeky* suggest that if the student is not to view the English of the classroom as something quite divorced from the English of the real world, he might be given some understanding of varieties of usage. Many literature selections provide interesting illustrations. For example, in Ring Lardner's "Haircut," the barber says, "You're a newcomer here, ain't you?" Rewriting this "nonstandard" English at other levels, students have produced:

> You just came to town, didn't you?
>
> Did you arrive here just recently?
>
> You are a comparatively recent arrival, are you not?
>
> I conjecture that you have perambulated only recently to our fair metropolis.

One of my colleagues asked a freshman class to change to more formal English the statement: "Hold on tight when we hit the curve." One student's response: "Practice adhesion while we circumvent the arc."

I must conclude this discussion by saying that the achievement of these objectives or others that I might have mentioned is frequently impeded by all the barriers that have been discussed here today. Across Canada, the average load of English teachers in the larger schools seems to be about 150 students. Many "English" teachers are draftees whose training has been in some subject other than English. Most of the university English departments across the country are concerned only with English literature and are moving hesitatingly, and sometimes reluctantly, into offering courses in the English language.

From comments made by our British colleagues, I conclude that three thousand miles of ocean have no influence upon the inhibiting effect of external examinations on the teaching of English. The problem has been with us for a long time. In 1958, after an examinations committee had finished making the provinicial grade twelve examination papers, one member summarized the situation with the statement, "Well, there goes the course of studies for 1959."

Mr. Chorny's investigation revealed that English teachers of grade eleven were giving much more attention than were teachers in grades nine and twelve to procedures usually considered effective in helping students to increase their skill in speaking and writing. These procedures included "free choice of topics, suggesting a purpose for the writing, the use of student and literary models, general discussion and motivation, providing some class time for writing, discussing themes after evaluation, and teaching follow-up lessons to eliminate student difficulties."[2] The point here is that in Alberta, students in grades nine and twelve write departmental examinations in June; grade eleven students do not.

Imitating Mr. Spouge's technique, I am going to conclude with a poem. This one was written by a grade ten student in one of my classes some years ago. It will never be included in an anthology of great poetry, but it does illustrate one or two points I have been trying to make, and it does express my feelings.

---

[2] *Ibid.*

TWO LITTLE INK BLOTS

I have heard it said there are lots of things

Removed due to
Copyright restriction.

I've done the best I could.

Discussion on the Teaching of Writing

Discussion was based on a broad comparison of emphases in the teaching of writing in England, Canada, and the United States. In England, more emphasis seems to be placed on creative writing, with less attention to formal, analytical grammar. In the United States, emphasis is basically on exposition, with attention to language skills in the elementary schools shifted to organizational skills in the high schools. Canada is making a strong attempt to design unified English programs which greatly deemphasize fragmented skills and analyses and which emphasize that writing grows from literary and personal experience.

III

English and the Elementary School

Pp. 111-22 removed due to lack of copyright permission

o reprint; Sybil Marshall, Experiment in Education

"English and the Primary School" adapted from Marshall's
(Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1963).

Language Centered Programs in the United States

Miriam E. Wilt

Sybil Marshall's struggle to find her way as described in her book, *An Experiment in Education,* was to me and should be to thousands of teachers an inspiration and a delight. What makes her paper provide us with so much truth is the fact that she has been through the mill or, as she says, "in the water." So many of the lectures prepared for great national conventions are written by armchair educationists in erudite and profound pedagese. However, she is a teacher who by experimentation, reading, self-discovery, and the resources of the university has managed to keep her feet on the ground and her head in the clouds. Can it work, one asks? And the answer is "Yes" because Mrs. Marshall has done it.

I have searched her comments for possible areas of disagreement—I have tried in vain to find a "Yes, but." She has said it all and said it much better than I could expect to do. Since we are in obvious agreement, I will begin by suggesting that several of her summarizing statements could serve as the base of the pyramid for improving English instruction in elementary schools.

> I would give them enough patterns, but not in the form of exercises. I would give the patterns in speech, in books, in poetry, in plays. I would not subject my pupils to ten minutes a day under the ultraviolet lamp of intense grammatical exercise, but instead seek out every patch of literary sunshine, and see to it that they worked and played in its warmth and light, until grammatical usage and good style, the balance and cadence of sentences, and the happy choice of the most significant words soaked into them through everyone of their senses.[1]

It is not that a philosophy is lacking. Dedicated teachers from Great Britain to New Zealand, from Canada to Florida, from Africa to Australia are using the model, or some variation of it, that Mrs. Marshall has described. The problem is a logistic one. For every teacher who understands the way language develops, an indeterminate number are textbook-workbook exercise teachers. Young starry-eyed teachers, fresh from our great teaching institutions, set out philosophically ready to really teach English only to find themselves lost in a morass of gear provided by a well-meaning but uninformed administration. Surrounded by the diction exercise, communicate-to-order, and speech-through-drama teachers, as well as printed curriculums and teaching aids, which they (the teachers) are afraid to ignore, they fall into the pattern, actually rut, of read and write and learn by rote.

---

[1] See Sybil Marshall, "English and the Primary School," p. 119.

> I have no intention of dealing with the mechanics of teaching young children to read, except to offer one word of warning to inexperienced head teachers ordering sets of readers for their infant classes for the first time. That bit of advice is that they should never forget that any new, bright, up-to-the-minute, gaily illustrated, a-la-mode expensive reading scheme is mere trash and quite valueless unless the actual English used, however limited the vocabulary, is intrinsically good and natural. The same applies, of course, to any book offered to the children at any stage in their education.[2]

I believe that this teaching potential need not be lost. I suspect, for example, that there are some very weak links in our "study, practice, and teach" chain of learning experiences. In my opinion, teachers need to understand the nature of language and understand also how it develops. They need to be familiar with the history and structure of language as well as the researches of Piaget, Loban, Strickland, Templin, and others. In preservice and in inservice experiences, such study should be the foundation upon which the teaching of English is built. During their preservice experiences, young teachers must see this kind of model in practice and participate in such teaching. As I have indicated, most of today's graduates are well instructed in the philosophy. Bolstered by their knowledge of language, familiar with method, they will still need support and reassurance on the job. They are responsible for breaking the lockstep of "contamination of too much instruction," "knowing all the rules and not having anything to write about."[3] If we really desire to legalize oral language or, in Mrs. Marshall's words, to stop dealing with speech as a necessary evil to be endured for as short a period of time as possible, the teacher must feel not only *not guilty* but also comfortable in what he is doing. The colleges and universities abdicate their responsibilities if they are not active beyond the training period to help and guide their beginning teachers in the first months when they are thrown so swiftly into the water. The schools themselves fail if the supervisory staffs working with college staffs do not offer every kind of help and encouragement while the novices get their feet wet. If it is true that one bad apple in a barrel can spoil the whole barrel, is it also not true that one good apple can bring about change that may set the hardened core reeling?

---

[2] Sybil Marshall, *An Experiment in Education* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 137.

In the schools themselves, the principals, supervisors, and inspectors, by helping teachers when necessary, can free them from textbook domination and exercise-bound curricula. Books to be "mastered" can be one of the greatest deterrents to real education. In an oral language centered school, children freely and spontaneously (with dialect intact) discuss their experiences, their feelings, their new knowledge, their sensory reactions; they see their own words transcribed into visual symbols; and writing and reading automatically follow. Books become important for the pleasure and information they contain. Writing, started as soon as the child can handle the tools, or even before with the help of a scribe, abets logical thinking and clarity in expression. Science, mathematics, the humanities, and the arts are the very heart of the development of language ability. The guidance given in the language centered school is not crippling but facilitating. Feeling free to talk helps the child to blossom out and not to clam up. Homely language and nonstandard dialect, at least in school, gradually give way to the school standard, through the teacher's own speech models as well as the rich prose, drama, poetry, and nonfiction that the child hears and eventually reads for himself. We have ample proof today that the rules of English are best learned in context, that whatever drill is necessary to fix a habit is best done in a meaningful setting and not by contrived exercises in a practice book. Children's own writing gives mute testimony to the quality of children's thinking and expression when the daily schema is not a thirty minute session of rote learning that "far from helping children understand their confusion . . . merely succeeds in confusing their understanding."[4]

---

[3] See Sybil Marshall, "English and the Primary School," pp. 119-120.

In visiting schools all over the United States and New Zealand, and in talking with my friends in Canada and Great Britain, I have been happy to find that we are all in about the same predicament with respect to creating language centered programs in the primary school. In a few places the quality of the programs is excellent and oral language is really booming, but the vast majority of the teaching population is still slave to the whims and biases of text and exercise book writers and to courses of study that seem completely unrealistic. There is more than a trickle of Mrs. Marshall's kind of English education, but it is far from a flood. All of us who help to prepare young teachers and to change existing school programs have our work cut out for us. The guidelines are clear, the road maps are charted; we are late, but not too late for the generations to come. The signal today is clearly "Go." As Mrs. Marshall herself says in *An Experiment in Education:*

> Good speech depends on a knowledge of words and how to use them, and so does written English. Both, however, are without purpose if there is nothing to be said or written. I wanted to build up in the children a love of English, not merely a knowledge of it. I wanted it to be to them a means whereby they could live their lives and order their experiences more consciously, and to the full. To be able to think clearly is the first thing needed towards "good English" to be critically and appreciatively aware of one's own immediate environment is to provide oneself with a criterion against which to judge the tiny, everyday incidents which together make up everybody's experience of life; to comprehend the printed word is to be able to explore the experience of others, farther afield in age, time, and physical distance; and to be able to record in words one's own deepest feelings, one's own excursions into the realms of thought and imagination, is to possess the key to the door of mankind's total experience, behind which lies the comprehension of the whole world of art. I saw my task of teaching English as one complete whole, and as such I continued to teach it.[5]

---

[4] See Sybil Marshall, "English and the Primary School," p. 119.

[5] Sybil Marshall, *An Experiment in Education* (Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1963), p. 136.

English in Canadian Primary Schools

H. M. Nason

After reading the paper, "English and the Primary School," prepared by Sybil Marshall, I discovered that I was in almost complete agreement with her statements. Perhaps this is a reflection of the worth of part of my education which I received in England under the guidance and direction of Sir Fred Clarke, who was Chairman of the Advisory Committee on Education to Great Britain's First Minister of Education. Sir Fred, in one of his lighthearted moments, once indicated to me that the discipline and controls in English education were very much like the disciplines that controlled the opening ceremonies of the British House of Commons, "where no one was ever seen directing anything but it all worked to a rigid formula."

The materials and methods used in the Canadian primary schools bear the mark of both the English and American systems. Actually, I have never been able to detect too much difference. I agree with George Allen's comments on "Literature Teaching in the English Schools" when he said that in the teaching and learning of English, our "two countries have so much in common that an Englishman visiting schools in the United States, as I did recently, or an American visiting schools in England could easily forget what country he is in."[1] It is my opinion that he could have included the Canadian schools in his remark.

Although in Canada the Governors in Council do prescribe textbooks and courses of study, there is more freedom than the system would indicate. I believe that in the English system the social vitality of the community is a stronger agent of discipline on the freedom of the teacher than the legislative requirements of the Canadian provinces. In the province of Nova Scotia, we state openly that a prescribed curriculum is only for the teachers who need it, and we attempt to develop the type of teachers who do not. It is, therefore, safe to say that in the best schools in Canada, there are almost as many methods as there are teachers in schools. We believe that everything a teacher says, everything a teacher does, everything a child sees a teacher do, has its educative effect on every child she teaches. Since we must start with the experiences of a child, and since Canada is presently noted more for its diversity than its unity, I would agree that there are almost as many ways of teaching English as there are schools and good teachers.

---

[1] See George Allen, "Literature Teaching in the English Schools," p. 29.

Mrs. Marshall has emphasized many factors that we attempt to point up to our teachers in both their preservice and inservice training. Her paper reflects an intimate knowledge of and belief in theories of teaching which I believe are soundly based, and she has supported them by excellent samples. We too often forget that by the time a child reaches school, he has in fact a very high degree of language skill; and we do not take advantage of that skill. Mrs. Marshall will have us build on the child's achievements outside school; this point of view, I believe, is completely sound.

It is our hope that the aim of teaching English in the Canadian primary schools is to develop in children their powers of oral and written expression. We want them not only to understand but also to enjoy what others have said and are saying both in speech and writing. We believe that the chief vehicle of communication is speech, and it should be the teacher's aim to develop in each child an individual skill in speaking. If we can at the end of the primary school be sure that our children have attained clear diction, with words and ideas expressed correctly and in an appropriate manner, we have made a major contribution to their continuing education.

It seems to me that in the written word we will have achieved our purpose if we teach our children to communicate ideas and experiences. They must be taught to record ideas and, as well, to understand the ideas and experiences recorded by others.

I think that one of our great weaknesses in teaching English in the primary school is our failure to realize the importance of being able to express ideas in speech. After all, people must speak continuously but they write only occasionally. Yet I believe that in some primary schools the time spent is very small compared with the time spent on written work. If we could convince our teachers to devote more time to speech training, better results in the expression of ideas in writing would be obtained.

Some people claim, and I agree with them, that in our primary schools in Canada, we are too technique conscious. We expect youngsters to write short compositions perfect in all respects. They are expected to observe all the rules of grammar and punctuation before they have had an opportunity to see and feel the value of communication. Before a child starts to write, he must have ideas, a vocabulary to express those ideas, and the confidence to use the vocabulary at his disposal without fear of unfair criticism. Sometimes we destroy the confidence of our youngsters by imposing too many high standards too early. This, I think, is one of the great weaknesses in our Canadian system of education.

In the Nova Scotia Department of Education, we find it is not easy to get our teachers to realize that the difficulty in marshaling ideas and presenting them in a clear way may be due to a shortage of ideas, an inadequate vocabulary, or lack of confidence. More especially, too, we find it difficult to make some teachers realize that the last item is the one that requires the most skillful handling by the teacher. It is, of course, almost impossible for a student to attempt to speak or write on something about which he knows little or nothing, without any opportunity for preparation, in an atmosphere where he is afraid to express himself because of the criticism he receives before an entire class.

We also try to lead teachers to realize that the expression of ideas in writing is much more complicated than in speech. For in writing, the hand cannot perform the mechanics of writing quickly enough to keep pace with the thoughts of the writer.

Once the child has a stock of ideas to express before he begins to write, then he is faced with the task of arranging them sensibly and logically, keeping them in mind throughout the process of writing, taking care at the same time that the writing is reasonably neat and legible, that the choice of words is appropriate, that the words are correctly spelled, and that the passages are suitably phrased and punctuated. How can we develop in all our primary teachers the knowledge that to do all these things well and simultaneously is not an easy task for a child or indeed for many adults?

Another bothersome problem in Canadian primary schools—brought to our attention by Mrs. Marshall—is that though there must be realization that the three conventions governing the English language—spelling, grammar, usage—can be ignored only at the risk of misunderstanding, that we must not demand respect for these conventions at the expense of expression by the child. Here we must have teachers who display reason and common sense. The teacher must judge, according to the background and present needs of his class, whether to correct every error or just certain errors of particular significance.

I agree with William T. Spouge in his paper, "Teaching Written and Oral English in Nonselective Secondary Schools," when he says, "The most important factor in language teaching is the absolute sincerity of the teacher's interest in his children as people, because he cannot teach the language in isolation when all his material must be sought in the common heritage."[2]

I think it was Trevelyan, in his *Social History of England,* who said that the aim of every education act in the first half of this century was to teach people to read and the aim of every education act in the last half of the century must be to teach people to discriminate. I agree with Trevelyan and I agree with Mrs. Marshall when she says that "discrimination is, after all, a judgment between standards and a real leader is one capable of making that judgment for himself."[3]

In the primary school when students are privileged to get their first glimpse of English literature, an attempt should be made to provide enjoyment, to stimulate the imagination and curiosity, and to widen and enrich the student's knowledge of human nature. By discussion in a congenial atmosphere, the teacher should help the pupil to develop some sense of discrimination. Here we have a problem: To what extent should the teacher color what the pupil receives from a book, a poem, or a play? To what extent should teachers choose what the pupils read? I believe that though it is most valuable to infect children with the love and enthusiasm for the very best in literature which the teacher himself feels and displays, it is also the duty of the teacher to develop the type of morally responsible individual who has the ability to choose and to discriminate. The only way we can have a free society where people are secure at the same time is to develop the morally responsible individual who chooses on the basis of standards.

In some of our Canadian schools, there is a tendency for people to refer to drama as an aspect of literature. I believe that the tendency towards a separation of drama from prose and poetry should not be allowed to become an excuse for the neglect of drama by the teacher of English.

---

[2] See William T. Spouge, "Teaching Written and Oral English in Nonselective Secondary Schools," p. 84.

[3] See Sybil Marshall, "English and the Primary School," p. 117.

If I have any criticism of Mrs. Marshall's paper, it is my impression that her discussion would apply more to the above-average child than to the average and below-average. I think, however, that Mrs. Marshall would agree that in teaching English to all children—the dull, the average, and the bright—certain fundamental principles apply; for instance, we must always start with a child's experiences regardless of how clever or dull he may be.

The fact that the dull child learns best through continual contact with concrete things and events, and in the end acquires a smaller stock of abstract and generalized ideas than the bright child, is a mark of relative and not absolute difference between the dull and the bright. After all, English is a functional subject. We, in Nova Scotia, try to create in the minds of our teachers the idea that purpose, for children, comes from doing something which seems worthwhile to them . . . and that to them studying English in the primary school is not necessarily a worthy purpose. Therefore, most of the English taught to the average and below-average student should arise naturally as a part of some activity in which the child is engaged. Books should be read for information that is required. Letters and reports should be written for some specific purpose; explanations should have to be given; incidents should be described and arguments expounded to carry forward some need the children feel to be real and vital.

Dull children are less able than others to deal with relationships of concrete objects which are not readily obvious, especially those which require language for their expression. Still less are they able to deal with things that are not before their eyes. Good teachers must always remember that one distinctive difference between dull and bright children is that the former find it much more difficult to talk and think intelligently about things not actually before their eyes.

Since language helps a child to fix his attention on what is not present to the senses and helps him to clarify his ideas, to store his memory with knowledge that will be useful when he comes to interpret new experiences, we must make sure that for dull children language work is not attempted at too abstract a level. We must put forth our best effort to make sure that all children—the dull as well as the more gifted—are (to use Sybil Marshall's words) bursting with things to write about.

Discussion on Teaching English in the Elementary School

The opening discussion asked, first, how to orient elementary school English teachers to the concept that language is the basis of all learning. Participants agreed that this question concerns the effort which English educators must make to support, supervise, and help the student teacher or the new teacher in order to prevent what Miriam Wilt called "pigeon-hole teaching." Sybil Marshall noted that the basic problem always seems to return to teacher training. In England, the problem is further complicated by the Headmaster system. Since the headmaster wields an all-powerful hand over his school, the new teacher is caught helplessly and coerced into the old ways of the headmaster. Mrs. Marshall noted that "perhaps one third of the schools in Britain are doing really worthwhile things."

Inservice training in England is of three dominant types: (1) strictly voluntary classes offered at the local level, (2) regular university classes, and (3) teacher training institutes which are very rare. Harold Nason reported that Nova Scotia brings in help from many sources the world over to instruct teachers in summer institutes. These consultants offer classroom teachers a much wider educational acquaintance than is possible through dependence on local faculty alone. Another program reported by Mr. Nason is the formation of study groups to meet throughout the year and culminate in summary sessions during summer school. Ruth Strickland described a school where all classes are dismissed each week at two o'clock on Thursday so that formal inservice training may begin.

The second concern for group participants was curriculum development. They generally agreed on the basic need for major grants or organized efforts, such as Project English, at the primary level. Participants noted that primary education is strongly subject to the dictates of publishers; until only recently in America, textbooks have dominated the elementary curriculum. Mrs. Marshall mentioned that in England the entire curriculum is thought of in terms of "adult standards." The "eleven plus" examination has, until recently, been the "standardizing standard."

Marion Edman brought up three prominent practical problems: (1) buildings which in size, design, and/or conditions restrict teacher and student freedoms, (2) the often staggering ratio of students to teachers, and (3) teachers' inability or unwillingness to make sufficient use of those *good* plant facilities which are provided. The group directed most of its attention to the last problem, in view of the fact that so often the first two are outside the control of the teacher. Most participants agreed that much can be done to improve "standard" curriculum if the teacher exercises reasonable ingenuity. Mr. Nason introduced the personal aspect of the problem, suggesting that understanding of young people is important. Children need, instead of continued early prodding, time for some natural development. Perhaps children should even be allowed to make some mistakes; confidence and competence seem to go hand in hand. Mr. Nason suggested that the art of teaching reduces tension to a minimum.

All discussants agreed that more freedom is imperative—both for the teacher and for the student. In order to gain this freedom, the teacher must exercise great self-discipline, a product of personal devotion. Too often, a generous freedom, ironically negated by excessive criticism, inhibits the student. Freedom for the children can only come from security, and it is the teacher's responsibility to develop a climate for feeling and sensitivity (i.e., the best way to make students like a poem that you, the teacher, like is to show them why you like it). The general conclusion was that, above all, education, particularly at the primary level, must be an individual process.

IV

The Uses and Effects of Examinations

Examinations and Literature

Frank Whitehead

It is not easy to convey to an audience such as yourselves the peculiarly key place occupied in our English educational system by external examinations. At present, our main examination for sixteen-year-olds (known as the Ordinary Level of the General Certificate of Education) is attempted every year, in some subject at least, by more than a third of all young people of that age. A new sixteen-year-old examination, intended for pupils of more nearly average ability and known as the Certificate of Secondary Education, was introduced this summer, and we expect that within a few years either one or other of these two examinations will be attempted by at least half of all sixteen-year-olds. Our eighteen-year-old examination (the Advanced Level of the General Certificate of Education) is attempted by a much smaller proportion of the age range (about an eighth), though this too is increasing rapidly.

But the influence of these examinations is not merely a matter of numbers; it is due essentially to their enormous prestige. The "pieces of processed parchment" (David Holbrook's expressive phrase) handed out to those who succeed in them have long been the indispensable passport for entry to all the occupations most highly regarded and most highly paid. Moreover, our examinations play a crucial role not only in vocational selection but also in educational selection. They select pupils at ages sixteen and eighteen for a limited number of places in universities, colleges of technology, and colleges of education; while at the more tender age of eleven our children are still (in many areas) given a foretaste of future ordeals by an examination known as the eleven-plus which selects them for different types of secondary school. Consequently, despite the theoretical freedom accorded to the individual teacher by our decentralized system, we find that in practice the demands of external examinations impose quite a large measure of uniformity upon teaching throughout the United Kingdom and that at many levels this influence reaches out to vast numbers of pupils who are never likely even to sit an external examination, let alone pass it. I suppose that in our classrooms the question one can hear most often is "Please sir, will we get this in the exam?"; and I am afraid that the inquiring visitor from another planet might well get the impression that our schools are dedicated first and foremost to grading and classifying pupils, and only after that to educating them.

Understandably there has long been a vigorous minority tradition of protest. Over thirty years ago A. N. Whitehead was denouncing external examinations because they favored the reproduction of "inert ideas" and urging that the pupil's own teacher should always frame the questions asked of the pupil. Eighteen months ago an official report came very near to recommending that the sixteen-year-old examination in English Language (the Ordinary Level of the General Certificate of Education) should be abandoned because of its harmful effects upon teaching; this year a collection of articles reprinted from Denys Thompson's periodical *The Use of English* has been published under the significant title, *English Versus Examinations.* Indeed the tension between mass examinations and genuine educational values seems always to have been at its most acute in the field of English teaching. No matter whether they are professionalized and statistically reliable like American standardized multiple-choice tests, or old-fashioned and amateurish like our essay-type papers, what examinations are best at measuring is knowledge, knowledge of facts. But in English teaching, and above all in the teaching of literature, it is the more tenuous and intangible qualities of experience and response that we as teachers set most store by; small wonder that we often doubt the possibility of assigning a numerical mark to them. Perhaps we have no choice but to conduct examinations in literature. If so, the strongest argument in favor of doing so belongs to those who say: in the present climate of opinion if we stopped examining literature, pupils would stop attaching any importance to it, and many schools would stop teaching it.

How then, in the situation I have outlined, do we actually set about examining literature? The dominant tradition is one which goes to work by testing "knowledge" of a small number of set books (at the sixteen-year-old level usually three, at the eighteen-year-old level from half-a-dozen to a dozen). These "set books" are seldom anthologies; they are more typically complete works—plays, novels, long poems. At the higher level the questions asked demand a display not only of "knowledge" but also of "critical appreciation." At the sixteen-year-old level the emphasis falls strongly upon "knowledge," and the clear-working assumption is that the more fully and sensitively a pupil has responded to a work of literature, the more accurate and detailed will be his memory of it. I believe the assumption is often well founded, but unfortunately the converse does not necessarily follow. Many teachers are convinced that in preparing for a "set books" examination, just as much as for a history examination, the surest way to obtain good results is to give out dictated notes and summaries which the pupil then memorizes. As a Chief Examiner once remarked in my hearing, "I have examined some very competent teachers in my time."

The questions asked are neither prestandardized nor pretested, and they fall into two main types: one, the so-called context question, prints an extract (say from a Shakespeare play) and then directs the pupil to give the meaning of particular lines or words, to relate who said this to whom and under what circumstances, and (perhaps) to comment on some point which has significance for plot, character, or dramatic action. The other calls for an essay-type answer in which the pupil gives in his own words an account of some episode, character, or line of thought—"Give an account of the wrestling scene in *As You Like It*"; "Give the gist of Brutus' speech to the mob after Caesar's death"; "Write short character studies of three of the following. . . ." The snag about such questions is that they foster, in teachers and pupils alike, a tendency to treat novels, poems, and plays as though the valuable thing about them were their extractable content of narrative or argument—the factual residue left behind *after* reading them. Yet, after all, it is not history we are concerned with but literature, and the so-called "facts" that gain credit from the examiner are in reality *fictions* treated overliterally. I have suggested elsewhere that the unique class of mark-gaining items which has been created in these examinations might more appropriately be called *ficts*—to borrow a mischievous word first coined by James Joyce in *Finnegans Wake*. And although I would not like to pillory my compatriots by implying that these extreme examples are at all typical, it must be admitted that preoccupation with *ficts* can lead at times to examination questions which are very odd indeed. "Tell in your own words the story of Bottom and his friends"—as though anything but the alchemy of Shakespeare's words could have kept this particular story in circulation for centuries. "What have you learned from the play (i.e., *A Midsummer Night's Dream*) of the habits and characteristics of fairies?"—a question which sounds as though it comes from a paper in natural history (maybe one should say *super*natural history).

It is only fair to add that even at our Ordinary Level *ficts* are seldom the only thing asked for. To the main body of the question it is customary to add a small tail demanding some elementary critical comment or some expression of personal reaction; to this tail there will be allotted perhaps a quarter of the marks for the whole question. However, in my own fairly extensive experience as examiner I have found that the great majority of candidates either ignore the "tail" or make a very poor showing at it; what they have learned to do is to retail *ficts* and by single-minded exercise of this accomplishment they can and do pass the examination—and even gain quite high grades. In recent years it has sometimes seemed that in the eighteen-year-old examination, too, *ficts* are beginning to count for more than they used to, particularly in the papers of one or two of the larger examining bodies which have to deal with a very large entry. If this is true, it lends support to those of us who believe that our most intractable difficulties stem from the mass nature of our examinations—the fact that many thousands of scripts have to be marked by a large panel of examiners within only two or three weeks. Under such circumstances there is an inevitable tendency to concentrate on features which the markers can all agree about and can rapidly identify—and in the literature examination this means, above all, *ficts*.

I have described in some detail the dominant tradition in our literature examining—that of the "set books" paper. I must mention also an alternative approach which though never widely popular has been in use for a great many years and has been resumed again on a wider scale by our new sixteen-year-old examination, the Certificate of Secondary Education. The pattern here is to provide a lengthy reading list (sometimes a virtually unlimited one) within which the pupil can make his own choices, and then to ask questions which are so general in form that they could apply to a wide range of individual books, poems, or plays. This does meet one objection often voiced to the set book system—namely that it restricts the width of pupils' reading. Certainly one would like the examination to encourage sixteen-year-olds to read more than three worthwhile books during the school year, and many teachers have doubted whether "doing" a few books thoroughly for an examination is the surest way of lodging them in young people's hearts. In a way this criticism has its greatest force when the books in question have been chosen for their appeal to the pupil rather than for their intrinsic merits. Close and detailed study of a Shakespeare play or a George Eliot novel will seldom be a dead loss for all one's pupils; but it does seem peculiarly inappropriate when, say, C. S. Forester's *The Ship* or J. B. Priestley's *An Inspector Calls* forms one of the three books which make up a year's course—to be read, reread, and written about ad nauseam, and then solemnly committed to memory.

Unfortunately there are also disadvantages to the "wide reading" alternative. It is not easy to frame questions which really fit a number of different books unless you make them vague or stereotyped. Often enough it turns out that what is demanded is once again *ficts,* the only difference being that the pupil has greater freedom to choose which string of *ficts* he reels off. The questions which do avoid this (variants probably on the formula "What have you found to enjoy in . . . ?") lay themselves wide open to the "prepared answer"; it is usually safer in a mass examination to say what you know to be expected rather than what you actually feel, since the conditions of marking are such that the highest rewards go to those who can fluently reproduce standardized opinions. (These are what the harassed marker can most easily recognize and rapidly tick with his red pencil.) Such questions are, in fact, highly vulnerable to the classic objection to all examinations in literature—namely that they set a premium on hypocrisy and encourage pupils (as Aldous Huxley once put it) to repeat "mechanically and without reflection other people's judgments."

I am conscious of having concentrated so far on the darker side of the picture. To correct the balance I must make clear that, despite the pitfalls, many teachers manage to reconcile examination-passing with good teaching and have contrived ingenious ways of pursuing their own enlightened aims without swerving aside very much to meet external syllabus requirements; they have, in fact, learned how to "work the system." Others, feeling themselves hampered and constrained by the existing examinations, have campaigned determinedly for modifications and improvements. The London Association for the Teaching of English did important pioneering work in the 1950's, and in the past two years our National Association has taken up the battle on a wider front, through a national conference followed by working parties and publications. Within the welter of constructive criticism and experiment now going forward, I would distinguish three main lines of thought.

The first tries to assess directly the candidate's ability to read a work of literature, a hitherto unseen poem or piece of prose, and asks questions which sample his understanding of it and response to it. The method stems originally from the work of I. A. Richards and was used first at the highest level of literary studies. A "Practical Criticism Paper" formed part of the English Tripos examination at Cambridge University in the 1930's; since the war a paper on these lines has been incorporated in the degree examination of almost all the other English universities. During the same period many Colleges of Education and most eighteen-year-old school examinations have introduced similar "unseen" questions, modified usually so that the wording gives rather more guidance as to what is expected. In the past few years the "question on an unseen poem" has spread downwards to several of our sixteen-year-old examinations, and my own experience of its use suggests that, with suitable safeguards, it can at this level test very effectively a pupil's ability to read and respond on his own, independent of the teacher's prompting. What is essential is that the poem should have genuine merit without being too difficult; that the experience embodied in it should be near enough to the pupil's own level so that he can enter into it unaided; and that the questions on it should be unerringly focused on the central structure of the poem's meaning, and should indeed in their wording and arrangement actively *help* the examinee to construct for himself the movement of thought and response which the poem requires of him.

To illustrate, I quote an actual example based on that fine poem, "The Line-Gang," by Robert Frost. Clearly no one can respond to a poem unless he has taken in the plain prose meaning of its statements; the questions start therefore by asking for "a clear account of what can be learned from the poem about the work performed by the line-gang." (It seems appropriate to put in this way for our pupils since the expression "line-gang" is not one they are likely to be familiar with.) The intention, however, is to sound out not only the reader's understanding but also his response to the nuances of feeling conveyed by imagery, rhythm, and "the sound of the words." The succeeding questions therefore focus attention on specific words or images which are central and "load-bearing" within the structure of poetic meaning which constitutes the texture of the poem. Thus reference is made to the opening line, "Here come the line-gang pioneering by," and the pupil is asked to explain clearly why the line-gang are said to be "pioneering by"; of the subsequent line, "They string an instrument against the sky," he is asked to say in what ways this is an appropriate and effective metaphor, a further question asks for explanation of and comment on the contrast which Frost brings out between the noisy hubbub of the line-gang at work ("in no hush they string it") and the subsequent "hush" in which words will run along the completed telegraph or telephone lines ("as hushed as when they were a thought").

What should be stressed is that these details have not been chosen arbitrarily or at random; they are precisely those key elements or nodes of meaning which, in a lesson concerned with the poem, one would ask one's class to dwell on and ponder over. They lead on quite naturally to a final question which sounds out the reader's grasp of the poetic experience as a whole; the pupil is asked to say, citing evidence from the poem, what feelings he thinks are inspired in the poet by the activities of the line-gang, a fairly searchng question, in fact, which calls for sensitive attention to the implications and tone of the poet's words. I myself believe that in this direct testing of response to an unseen passage or poem there lies the key to most of our examining problems.

I can see only two valid objections. First, finding the right questions—those which genuinely arise out of and sensitively reflect the unique qualities of the chosen poem or extract— is a difficult and highly skilled task; it is so much easier to fall back upon an inflexible formula. Secondly, because practical considerations demand the unseen to be short, this might lead, in teaching, to an undue concentration upon short poems and short extracts, to the neglect of the kind of staying power exacted by the reading of a more extended work of literature.

Our second main line of current thought does in fact begin by insisting that pupils need to grapple at first hand with some full-length novels, plays, or poems. But (it is asked) does the prescribing of a set book really make inevitable all the present pointless emphasis upon memorization and regurgitation? Surely we can get away from this by demanding that the pupil shall have a copy of the text beside him in the examination room when he comes to answer questions about it? Under such conditions what counts will be not memory for *ficts* but that relevant kind of familiarity with the text which makes it possible to turn up evidence needed to support a statement or opinion. Administrators have, perhaps understandably, been reluctant to accept this argument, reasonable though it has seemed to many of our teachers. At long last, a few examining boards are now experimenting with the idea in a small way—with one volume of poetry or one Shakespeare play. My only fear is that the examiners may be slow in realizing that the new conditions necessitate framing completely new types of questions.

Finally (our third line of thought), there are those who advocate a system of internal examinations with external moderation, believing (with A. N. Whitehead) that all assessments should be made by those actually teaching the pupils concerned. Not only does this free the teacher to decide on the most suitable books, topics, and activities for his own class; it also allows taking into account a wider sample of the candidate's work, spread over a number of occasions and over a variety of tasks. Some of us, moreover, feel that in regard to literature there is a particularly strong case for basing assessment on year-round work rather than on a single occasion at the end.

Apart from those which confine themselves to "unseen" questions, there is after all a peculiar artificiality about any literature examination. What should be concerning us is the extent to which the pupil has taken into himself the experience embodied in the work of literature and made it his own; yet this has happened, if it has happened at all, on some other occasion, weeks or even months ago. All that we can ever get in the examination room is a pale copy, a reconstruction—a lukewarm rehash, one might say, of yesterday's joint. If we must try to measure literary response, why not do so while it is still fresh and alive?

Of course it can be objected that to rely on internal assessments is to introduce a further source of unreliability into an area where judgments are already hopelessly subjective. Actually in the schemes now being tried out for both sixteen-year-old examinations, the methods used to obtain comparability of standards are both carefully thought out and statistically ingenious. It is still too early to make any prediction about their success, but many of us hope that in the long run they will prove to be no more unreliable than our traditional external examinations, and considerably more valid. Certainly their influence upon teaching should be far more desirable.

And this, I believe, is the note on which to end this hurried survey of our new approaches to the examining of literature. These developments have come about because teachers in our schools have felt the urge to change existing patterns so that their own educational practice may be able to move forward; they are, in fact, a response to the needs of the classroom situation. They give us confidence in the eventual outcome of the debate which is now raging and of the struggles which lie ahead.

The Use of External Tests in Public Schools in the United States

Paul B. Diederich

As many of you know, Educational Testing Service is our largest and oldest national testing agency and the one most nearly comparable to the various examining boards and councils in England. Its present name may be new to you, since it stands for a merger of the principal nonprofit testing agencies in 1947; but its oldest member, the College Entrance Examination Board, goes back to 1900, and its Cooperative Test Division, which sells the largest number of its tests, was founded in 1930. Its offerings may be divided into two main classes:

1) "Secure" tests for admission to college, graduate and professional schools, etc., which are administered only in a worldwide network of testing centers on certain dates under the supervision of proctors paid by ETS.

2) Published tests of aptitude and achievement which are sold to schools and colleges and administered by them whenever they choose.

The published tests are comparable to those provided by private test publishers of which the largest are Harcourt Brace & World, Houghton Mifflin Company, the Psychological Corporation, Science Research Associates, and the California Test Bureau. This is not a large enterprise, for sales of published tests from all sources still amount to less than $25 million a year. In schools that use such tests at all, the typical student is likely to encounter them only five or six times below the point at which college entrance and scholarship tests are given. Some tests are given every year but not to all students. If I may oversimplify a bit, the most common practice is to give intelligence or aptitude tests in grades three and eight and a battery of achievement tests in grades four, seven, and ten—or not more than once every three years.

These tests are bought almost exclusively by school administrators for what an industrialist would call "quality control." If scores in reading, arithmetic, history, or science are lower than the general scholastic ability of these students would lead one to expect, the administrator wants to know about it and take steps to remedy the deficiency.

None of these tests determine the educational future of students to anything like the same extent as the eleven-plus or the G.C.E. examination in England. In the larger schools they are used along with school marks to place students in fast, regular, or slow sections, but whenever there is a discrepancy between the test scores and teachers' judgments, the latter are likely to prevail, and this practice is upheld by the testmakers themselves. Neither basis is used to channel students into different types of schools, for nearly all now enter the same comprehensive junior and senior high schools. Nor is their rate of progress through school affected, for about 90 percent of these students will be found in the grade corresponding to their chronological age. A student may be in a fast section for twelve years and still graduate at the same age as another who has been in a slow section throughout. The former simply covers more ground and is more likely to go to college.

None of the widely sold achievement batteries include questions on whole books or plays that are assumed to be read in school because no such assumption can be made. In a nationwide survey of required reading two years ago, we found only seventeen works that were required in more than 20 percent of public high schools in grades seven through twelve.[1] At the top was *Macbeth,* required by 90 percent. Next came *Julius Caesar* and *Silas Marner,* 75 percent. In the third rank were *Hamlet, Great Expectations,* and *A Tale of Two Cities,* 35 percent. The most popular American works were *Our Town, The Red Badge of Courage, The Scarlet Letter,* and *Adventures of Huckleberry Finn,* required by an average of 35 percent. The only other works required by more than 20 percent were the *Odyssey, Idylls of the King, Evangeline, Pygmalion, Merchant of Venice, Ivanhoe,* and *Treasure Island* in that order. Please do not infer that the works less frequently required were inferior. They included some excellent choices, but since each English department may choose whatever it likes, none of the other titles appeared in more than 20 percent of our reading lists.

---

[1] Scarvia B. Anderson, *Between the Grimms and "The Group": Literature in American High Schools* (Princeton, N.J.: Cooperative Test Division, Educational Testing Service), April 1964, pp. 8-9.

With this diversity of literary fare, it is easy to see why we do not have the kind of examination on set books that Frank Whitehead discusses with such candor. I was agreeably surprised, for most of our English visitors tell me with a trace of condescension that this is the sort of examination we ought to adopt. Perhaps they do not realize that we gave such examinations from 1900 through 1940 but dropped them in 1941 in response to pressure by high school English teachers. They wanted no committee of college professors to be telling them what books their students would have to read. I gather that a similar revolt is brewing in England.

Our substitute for such examinations in all achievement batteries that are widely sold is a reading comprehension test, ranging from forty to seventy minutes in length and consisting of short passages and poems of varied types, each followed by five to ten multiple-choice questions. Such a test is easy to ridicule because it seems to get at nothing more than the ability to answer plain-sense questions on snippets, but when it is devised and pretested by competent people, it turns out to be one of the very best predictors of school marks—not only in the next course in literature but in all subjects. I myself have been one of our strongest advocates of providing tests on a wide selection of whole books for such schools as require them, chiefly to set an example of the kinds of questions that our best teachers and scholars ask about such works. At last we are about to publish examinations on twenty-five major literary works that are most commonly required in grades seven through twelve.[2] Since most students are unprepared for questions like these, each examination comes in two parallel forms, one of which may be handed out as a study guide along with the book. Students answer the questions as they read the book and hand in their answers when they finish it. The teacher scores this preliminary examination and thus finds out what the students were able to do on their own and what still remains to be done through class discussion. The final examination then becomes a measure of the effectiveness of this discussion, and with such ample warning and preparation, it is unlikely to be a traumatic experience. I hope that teachers will secretly attach greater importance to scores on the preliminary examination than on the final, for the test of how well one has taught *Tom Sawyer*, for example, is not how well the students know it after instruction but how well they read *Huckleberry Finn* on their own. For this reason we hope to furnish tables of comparable scores that will make each preliminary examination as well as each final examination directly comparable with those on other works of the same general character. Naturally we do not expect any teacher to buy all twenty-five examinations, but a large number may select one examination for each grade, and the department may select another to be administered on the same date to students in grade 7-8-9 or 10-11-12 as a measure of their growth in literary competence.

---

[2] In addition to works listed above, our titles include *Oedipus Rex, Pride and Prejudice, The Return of the Native, Walden, Moby Dick, Tom Sawyer, The Bridge of San Luis Rey, The Old Man and the Sea.*

Since I have given a good deal of thought to this new development, I know what an examination on a whole book can do that a reading comprehension test is unlikely to do, but I do not despise the latter on this account. It would not surprise me if the best predictor of scores on the new examinations proved to be scores on our present reading comprehension tests, for there is no doubt whatever that they can pick out students who are capable of reading such works and other students who will find them difficult. In an examination that is to be given throughout the country, a reading comprehension test has obvious advantages, for it does not foster drill on a few set books per year in the way that Mr. Whitehead deplores.

In fact, his favored alternative—questions on a short passage or poem that students encounter for the first time in the examination—and particularly the kinds of questions he would ask about "The Line-Gang" by Robert Frost made me consider using the same kinds of questions in multiple-choice form and comparing my results with his *in England*. If Mr. Whitehead scored all the written answers himself, his scores might predict school marks in the next literary course better than mine; but if the written answers were scored in haste by a large number of examiners, our American experience suggests that my scores might pick out the good and poor readers a bit better than theirs. I know that clever and conservative people can give a hundred reasons why even the best machine-scored test can never do as well as an experienced reader of answers composed by students, but the fact remains that it *does* whenever the two methods are used by equally competent people in a large-scale examination. I am told that our English friends are not used to such comparisons but may soon be exposed to them. We have just enjoyed a long visit by Anthony Sainesbury, Deputy Director of the University and Schools Examination Council, University of London. He was most impressed by the fact that ETS has a whole section that does nothing else all year long but check the accuracy of our predictions. He took copious notes on our procedures, and I should not be surprised if he tried something along these lines in England: for example, an objective test of interpretation of sight passages *versus* a written test scored by readers, as predictors of success in the next course in literature. The objective test must be allowed a larger number of questions because that is its normal advantage. It will be one of those classic contests: the tailor against the sewing machine, the abacus against the computer, our own tall-tale hero John Henry against the pneumatic drill. If it succeeds, I must go to England to see it, and I expect to win a lot of bets.

Now I must turn to the other side of our test offerings: the "secure" tests for admission to college, graduate and professional schools, and the Service Academies of our Armed Forces as well as for such other purposes as teacher certification. These tests are given only in our own testing centers, chiefly in this country but also in major cities throughout the noncommunist world. If Mr. Whitehead and his examiners are feeling the pressure of a vast increase in the number of candidates, I should mention the fact that most of these examinations are machine-scored and the results printed on score-report forms in multiple copies at the rate of six thousand an hour.

Most of our candidates are accepted by at least one of the colleges to which they first applied, and the rest find a place somewhere—if not in a College Board college, then in one that does not require these examinations, and about two thirds of American colleges do not. So far, no candidate is excluded from college altogether by these examinations. It is not their purpose to keep anyone out of college. All they keep him out of is the *wrong* college: that is, one in which he is unlikely to succeed.

Anthony Sainesbury was also struck by the fact that our testmakers as well as our college admissions officers regard scores on these external examinations as supporting evidence that is never considered in isolation but always in conjunction with the high school record. We know, and we keep reminding admissions officers, that the best predictor of success in college is the high school record; the next best is the set of five scores on our tests; and all we claim is that a combination of both yields better predictions than either one alone.

Mr. Sainesbury concluded that this double-barreled approach to the admissions problem enables our testmakers to adopt a more modest aim than his English examiners but then to check up everlastingly on how often we hit the target. This observation did not set very well with us, but after mulling it over I think I see what he meant. Our aim in these examinations is *prediction* pure and simple. My colleagues are so inured to this attitude that they ask, "Why not? What more do you want than an accurate prediction?"

Mr. Whitehead's paper provides an answer, and the last point that I wish to discuss. Note what he says: "In the present climate of opinion if we stopped examining literature, pupils would stop attaching any importance to it, and many schools would stop teaching it."[3]

We assume no such responsibility for the right conduct of our teachers and our schools. For obvious reasons our science examinations offer no test of laboratory techniques, yet our science teachers are not thereby deterred from offering laboratory experience. Since they know that it is essential, they require it and fail students who are inept. That part of their training shows up in the school record, and it would cost too much to duplicate it in our examinations.

For similar reasons our English Composition Test now includes two twenty-minute objective exercises that have proved to be good indicators of skill in composition and only twenty minutes of actual writing. Our critics keep saying that this will lead to the abandonment of any attempt to teach composition and the substitution of drill on workbooks. But I spend a great deal of time visiting classes and meeting with groups of English teachers in all parts of the country, and I have yet to find a teacher who is that foolish or irresponsible. They know that practice in writing is essential and they work hard at it, even under adverse conditions.

The most surprising fact of all is that since 1940 we have offered no test in English or American literature except the recent Advanced Placement Test in English, which is taken by about one percent of our candidates. We have a reading comprehension test as part of our Scholastic Aptitude Test but no test that would prove that a student had ever read a book. The difficulties of constructing such an examination when no two schools require the same books proved insuperable. I must confess that this gap in our offerings gives me nightmares, and I have tried to plug it up with the examinations on twenty-five major literary works that

---

[3] See Frank Whitehead, "Examination and Literature," p. 138.

I have mentioned. But I ought to relax, for investigations conducted by our National Council show that English teachers devote more time to literature than to everything else combined, and there is no evidence of slacking off at any time since 1940.

Hence I should like to leave this question with Mr. Whitehead: Are your examinations really so influential that anything you did or left undone could keep English teachers from teaching literature? I doubt that anything short of a nuclear holocaust could do that.[4]

---

[4] *Postscript.* The general tenor of my question prompted a basic reply from several sessions of this conference: "Examinations ought to reward the kind of teaching that I do and penalize the kind that the other fellow does." Our College Board would regard this position as dangerous. The other fellow is clearly in the majority and tends to be more interested in examinations than the creative teacher. His kind of teaching is also easier to test. What happens when he wins a majority on the examining committee? Then the only protection against him is to insist that the examination limit itself to skills, understandings, etc., that have proved to be indispensable in further study. Those students who have them do well; those who do not have them are handicapped. Whether they acquired them the right way or the wrong way is not the business of a testing agency. If it were, you may be sure that sooner or later it would be the other fellow who made this decision.

The Impact of Examinations on American Independent Schools

William H. Brown

In commenting on "Examinations and Literature" by Frank Whitehead, I would point out first that our students do not go over the progressive hurdles which he outlines. In staggering numbers they take examinations which are a part of their admission folders for an equally staggering number of colleges and universities. Mr. Whitehead comments only on external examinations; I therefore concern myself with these as opposed to examinations which we set for ourselves within our schools. The examinations whose impact upon the independent school I am to measure are, then, two: the English Composition Test and the Advanced Placement Examination in English, both set by the College Entrance Examination Board and administered and engineered by the Educational Testing Service. It would be a waste of time and a presumption for me to describe these examinations. I shall, therefore, confine my remarks to their "impact," which, by the way, is something of an exaggeration. The effect could better be described as the light dusting of a feather.

Let me say that I can speak only for my own school, which is a large boarding school consisting of 850 students scattered over four grades. It draws its students from all the states of the union but has a distinctly eastern urban and suburban concentration. The school has an extensive scholarship program with the result that there is a wide spread of economic backgrounds. Last year the median SAT score for seniors was 651; the median MAT, 700. I give you these facts to indicate how representative of independent schools my remarks may be.

When I was a member of the examining committee for the

English Composition Test, I had a running argument with members of the Educational Testing Service and the College Board as to the relationship between examinations and the teaching in the schools. The position of ETS was that the service had no responsibility for the effect of their examinations on the learning process of those who were taking them and who were or were not admitted to the college of their choice partially on the basis of the results. ETS, as a matter of fact, claimed that preparation for the test could have no measurable effect. My own experience as a teacher was that I could increase the scores of my students by as much as one hundred points by familiarizing them in the ways to unscramble paragraphs, fill in the last lines of poetry from multiple choice, distinguish between main and subordinate statements, and above all make the acceptable corrections on an interlinear. For the quick manipulators, this familiarizing took very little time. Apparently there were others who felt as I did, for soon the market was flooded with practice booklets along these lines. What is more, schools quickly adopted the practice of having candidates take the examination twice, once to make the student familiar with the instructions and the practices, a second time to measure his skill in composition.

It was not particularly gratifying to be told last year by a representative of ETS that specific preparation for the test was found to produce measurable results. However, the training which I gave took no more than two hours of class time a week before the examination. The point I want to stress now is that this training had no effect upon the writing that my students did before or after the test. Nor, indeed, did the results on the examination bear any resemblance to the relative skills of the students. Why should they when the composition test contained no composition? This, however, is beating a dead horse. The test now has a twenty-minute sample of "free writing" and will soon be expanded to a two-hour examination, half of which will be devoted to sentences composed by students. One point, however, is worth making. For years I correlated the scores of students on the composition test with marks in English and with the verbal scores on the SAT. Except at the very extremes of top and bottom scores, there was no correlation with either the English grade or the verbal SAT score. There was, however, a good enough correlation between the mathematical SAT score and the English Composition Test to suggest that the two were testing the same skills, whatever they were.

By way of summary, I would say that the impact of the English Composition Test upon the independent schools has been very slight and that such effect as there has been has been either detrimental or a waste of teaching time. As more writing appears on these tests, there can not help but be a greater and more beneficial effect.

The Advanced Placement Examination is another story. Here, I believe, the impact is far greater. As this program has expanded to include an extraordinary number of schools and colleges, the effect upon the teaching in the schools has been startling. From the beginning, the AP demanded the formation of special classes. The material to be covered in these classes has been gradually articulated. The level of reading and the kind of writing to be done has been defined within broad limits; the result has been some exciting teaching to excited students. These classes have in turn led to innovations and the raising of standards in regular classes. Meeting the demands imposed by a three-hour examination, all of which is free response read by real, live readers can not help but revive an interest in reading important books and a responsibility to write intelligently and fluently about them.

Lest I seem euphoric, I would point to some difficulties involved in the Advanced Placement Examination. The first is, perhaps, an advantage rather than a difficulty. The examination itself has no bearing on college admission, although a student's presence in an AP class might. The result is that the examination can be and sometimes is treated cavalierly by the student, especially when he finds that the college to which he is going pays little attention to it. The second is the unpredictability of the results. Each year approximately 100 of our 240 seniors take the examination. Less than half of these 100 are from Honors courses, our equivalent to AP courses. Those from these Honors courses do not score appreciably better; indeed, they often score lower than those from regular sections. I am aware that this discrepancy may well be an indictment of our Honors courses. However, I have kept a box score of my own students from both regular and Honors courses. I have predicted a score from one to five for each student on the basis of his work over the year. There has been a disheartening gap between these predictions and the actual scores on the examination. There is again the strong possibility that the fault lies with me and my students, not with the examination.

Naturally, however, I look to the examination. Since the literature and composition examinations were combined into one, the examination has fallen into a predictable pattern: close reading of a poem or demanding prose and an essay on both a literary and nonliterary topic. The explication has been made up of a series of questions of detail and interpretation. The poem or prose passage has often been surprisingly familiar, one which the student could well have studied in class. The essay on literature has of necessity been very general, since the College Board does not require the reading of any specific texts for the examination although it does offer a suggested list. The nonliterary question has from time to time invited generality by the so-called springboard question—a quotation which is intended to direct the student's thinking along loosely defined lines. On the whole, questions have not always, I believe, been carefully pretested. At almost every reading I have encountered frustrating inconsistencies in the wording which have hampered the reading and probably affected the reliability.

All of this is by no means a condemnation of the examination. I am suggesting that too often the examinations have not been exciting for the well-trained and highly charged students from all parts of the country who are taking it.

I would therefore make a special plea. I urge that the College Board, perhaps together with the Commission on English, outline in some detail, which would include specific texts, the course which would prepare students for the examination. There is a crying need to articulate the four years of study of English in the secondary schools. This course could be the beginning of such an articulation or at least point the direction it should take. It would also set a more useful national standard, and it would of course make possible examinations which would not have the imperfections of some in the past.

I am well aware that in this plea I am running counter to Mr. Whitehead's findings in Great Britain and to the general feeling of most of my American colleagues. However, I do not feel that such a course must result in Mr. Whitehead's amusing but terrifying "ficts." Unless we know what we are examining, we examine a vacuum and should not be surprised by the vacuity of the papers. Quite apart from whether we examine or not, it is past the time when we should indicate to the students that we know what we are doing in the study of English, that there is a stage in his development at which he is ready for irony, for symbol, for allegory, for satire, for tragedy and that there are works which best introduce him to these. The English building at my academy has been dubbed by the students as the old curiosity shop—and there is no affection in the epithet. It is little wonder that in the struggle for the students' time, energy, and commitment the doors of the curiosity shop are not besieged as are those of the mathematics centers and science laboratories, where presumably they know what they are doing.

Discussion on the Use of Examinations

The two main areas of discussion concerned the preparation and content of examinations and the impact of examinations on education in England, Canada, and the United States. Though participants generally felt that it would be desirable in pre- and inservice training to instruct teachers to ask significant questions and to prepare better examinations, some wondered how this might be done; they thought that only experience can offer the teacher insight into constructing effective examinations. One of the most difficult responsibilities of teaching is the preparation of test questions which serve for the wide range of abilities in a normal class.

William Brown felt that composition tests often do not teach composition, but simply reward manipulative skills instead of other basic verbal skills. He suggested instead the use of timed drills in place of the two-hour writing which is often graded by readers. These drills would consist of forty problems in composition. Paul Diederich pointed out that the Educational Testing Service (ETS) uses multiple-choice questions in its standardized examinations. He wondered if these could ever "be fair to the millions," but ETS eliminates many problems which would otherwise result from decisions made in grading by widely dispersed examiners. ETS plans in these multiple-choice examinations types of answers which are typical of those which might be secured through written answers. The questions are based on problems of meaning and tone, but they often create such dangers as the fragmentation of a poem.

The impact of examinations has been heavy in all three countries. In England, examinations are critically important in course selection for secondary schools and colleges. In Canada, university entrance examinations are based solely on information from content in high school courses. In the United States, the impact has been significant. Mr. Diederich mentioned that the United States does take into account the school record more than do the English or the Canadians; ETS tells colleges and universities to study the high school record first, then look at the standardized test scores. But because many freshmen at state universities are dropped every year, high school teachers tend to try to prepare students for tests at the state-university-freshman level. Richard Corbin reported a similar problem in New York, where teacher advancement was for many years determined by teacher records based on Regents' examination results. Joseph Mersand observed that, all life being a series of examinations, he did not share the reservations expressed by others about the overemphasis on testing. What he wanted to ensure was the adequacy of the examinations. J. N. Hook noted that much trouble lies in the failure of teachers to distinguish whether tests are being used as a measure of achievement or as a predictor. In addition, he suggested still another use of tests, the diagnosis of students' needs. Some discussants were concerned about students who now seem to emphasize scores on examinations more than genuine learning, sensitivity, or even honor in their motivation for study. English educators must not mislead students into feeling too strongly the great pressures that can be unleashed through an overemphasis on examinations.

V

Higher Education, Teacher Education, and Research

The Scope of English Studies in British Universities

Richard Hoggart

The number of university English departments in Great Britain is minute compared to that in the United States. Yet there are several dozen, quite varied in their ways. Only a rash man would claim to be able to describe comprehensively what happens in Oxbridge, the smaller and larger civic universities, the new universities, the cellular London colleges, the Scottish, Welsh, and Northern Ireland universities and colleges; and only a fool would try to do so in a single short paper. I shall trace what to me are the more interesting elements—old and new—in the map as it is today.

I shall be critical, in stressing which of the many new approaches seem promising and which do not. But the first thing to say concerns our traditional practice, not recent changes. Most departments seem reasonably competent in fulfilling the aims they have set themselves. There are differences in standards between departments, but no gross or shocking differences. That is to say, if you accept the aims of a particular department, you are likely to be satisfied to find that they are conscientiously fulfilled and that the bulk of the students do emerge trained in the way the department has defined a training in English. In spite of what some of my colleagues say, I do not think that expansion in numbers, which has gone on quickly in the last few years, has weakened this claim.

The backbone of my argument is that we are today under great presure of change, and that not all departments have taken sufficiently critical stock of these pressures, with the result that they have either dangerously ignored them or have accommodated themselves too easily to them. Traditionally, we have done two things quite competently. First, we have ensured that, in a professional sense, English is kept up. We have had on the staffs of the departments, and have trained within each new generation, those specialists who could maintain the subject—as literary historians, editors, scholars of various kinds. We have produced some good scholarly specialists during the half or three quarters of a century that English has been a university subject. Nowadays we probably have fewer than you have in the United States, partly because we are so much smaller in numbers, partly because you are much more "professionalized" than we are and can develop that kind of man. There are gains and losses in both positions, in our comparative amateurism as in your professionalism.

On the whole we have been more hospitable to scholars than to critics (though we can be generous towards a scholar-critic, and that is a respectable attitude). But there is, in some places, suspicion of the stongly held critical positions or of the teacher who invites his students to make value judgments. The same attitude is common enough in America, though for different social and cultural reasons. I do not share this attitude—except occasionally (say, after marking a set of first-year papers full of opinionation but almost empty of knowledge).

Second, we have taught closely and carefully in small groups. This is a general feature of British university education; our proportion of staff to students is approximately one to eight. We have put special stress on continuous personal contact during each academic session between one student and the same tutor—say, a weekly hourly meeting alone, or with very few other students. The extent of this tutorial provision in British universities is not sufficiently widely known, even in Britain. Many graduates and teachers of Oxbridge think tutorial teaching does not exist outside their walls. In each of the four civic universities in which I have worked as student and teacher, tutorial teaching has been going on since their foundation or for decades.

It obviously will be difficult to keep this up as numbers expand, since we will probably have to let the staff-student ratio widen. But in a large department one can economize in lecturing time. One can lecture to fifty as effectively as to twenty-five, and what is saved there can be given to tutorials. We should be able to provide a weekly tutorial in quite small groups for at least the increased numbers we have currently planned to take.

But though our numbers have been small, only a tiny proportion of our graduates could become scholars in universities. Most of the others have become teachers, particularly in grammar schools (and since most of those were girls and many soon married, there has been a constant need for replacements). Before the war, especially, the government's grants system pushed working class and lower middle class students along this route.

The staffs in English departments have always known that they were chiefly training teachers of English. But most of them have paid little or no attention to the implications of this fact for their approach to their own teaching. Though they might well be very helpful to their students in various personal ways, in teaching they have acted as though their whole concern was the maintenance of scholarship and the transmission of scholarly standards to new scholars.

This absence of mind has had great advantages. Above all, it has meant that departments have not been tempted to compromise their subject, to trim its demands so as to meet an external, vocational need—like the English programs in some of your own teacher training colleges in which a minute body of creative literature is pulverized, like a plant under a steam-press, by a vast body of pedagogic theory; or like some of the courses in technical or commercial English or English for the twentieth century or Communications which are now springing up in a variety of British institutions for higher education.

Although most of our students have not become scholars, it could be argued—and sometimes has been true—that some sense of scholarly standards has been given, something has rubbed off, a perspective and a benchmark have been indicated, and thus been bound to improve the quality of the student's subsequent teaching in the most important sense of all. Without that, his approach would be irremediably secondhand, second-rate, parochial.

The disadvantages of what I called this absence of mind have been at least as great. The students live in and go out to teach in a society whose relation to the humane values of literature study is intensely difficult to define, which uses language increasingly as a tool or a weapon rather than as a means to truth. The clash between our claims for literature's function and the reality —and, often, between the model of high culture we have offered our students and the nature of their family and neighborhood life —has been extreme. But we have left them to sort things out for themselves or to remain split. Sometimes the clash has seemed more extreme than it actually is, but we have given no help in either stressing genuine distinctions or suggesting possible connections. How could we, when our own cultural map has been so crudely sketched?

The great exception to this generalization is in the work at Cambridge of Dr. Leavis and his colleagues on *Scrutiny*. Reading

Scrutiny for the first time as an undergraduate, you knew—whatever your disagreements or doubts about some of its attitudes—that this was the really important concern. That work has had widespread influence, but (and this is the great irony) it has been far more influential in its effect on English teaching in grammar schools, secondary modern schools, and training colleges than in the universities themselves. With one or two partial exceptions, university English departments have let the movement wash round their walls; schools and teachers' training colleges, not so easily able to ignore those problems which Dr. Leavis's approach to English faced, have seen its point.

As a result, university education departments which contain specialists in English and in the teaching of English have had too few links with the English departments within their own universities. Much the same has been true in the Institutes of Education, which work with teachers already. This is a bad division, and the sooner we end it the better.

On to this scene have now come changes, a great many changes. It is important for us to understand these changes better, for at present most of our attitudes to them—whether in favor or opposed—are based on unsupported opinions. In particular, those who regret the new situation sometimes talk as though they are holding on while the ship goes down, with eyes shut tight. If they opened them and took over the steering, they might see that things are after all not quite as bad as they think.

Most consequences of the increasing size of departments seem to me promising. The most important gain is that large departments, if they are carefully organized, can accommodate more variety of approaches. Small departments can easily be thin or badly one-sided. Large departments can have mixed economies and, so long as they are all worthwhile in themselves, remain fruitful. Much the same is true of graduate work. Large departments can have sizeable groups of graduates working in similar areas with mutual benefit. But I need not underline that point in the United States. Large departments can have more than one full professor, and this offers several new advantages and lessens several old dangers.

Our pattern of teaching is changing too. There seems to be a movement towards a more integrated three-way system of undergraduate teaching—by lectures, seminars, and tutorials. To some extent this has always existed but it has been given a fillip by the problems raised by expansion within the British situation. How can we accept many more students and yet keep close personal teaching? The half-dozen or so new universities—one English department in a new university is teaching wholly by seminars and tutorials—have probably inspired some of the rethinking in other universities, too. My impression is that the seminar has gained most ground in the last few years (usually held in groups of eight to fifteen), and that most of this ground has been gained at the expense of the formal lecture, not of the tutorial.

Similarly, in some departments more thinking has been going on than has gone on for a long time about the content and style of courses—again, probably prompted by expansion and by experiments at the new universities. Towards the new universities the others have a very ambiguous attitude, which is understandable. The new universities sometimes claim to be doing, and are praised in the press for doing, "new" things which have in fact been quietly done for years at older places.

Those who planned the English departments in the new universities have set out to create patterns of study nearer to their hearts' desire, and it is refreshing to read their syllabuses, even though most of them explain in a preamble, with happy humility, that what English teaching in British universities has needed for decades is precisely the type of degree course which they have fashioned at X'bridge or Y'bridge. Curiously, these courses differ from each other at least as much as the courses at the other universities differ from each other—which shows, not that the architects of the new courses are self-deluded, but that possible approaches are more various than we have been used to think.

Among newly developing branches of study I will note the rise of modern linguistics with which our American friends are well acquainted. I welcome it, and in particular the possibility of new links between it and more strictly literary study and between them both and other disciplines. So I hope we will not be tempted to see it as a late twentieth century substitute for the study of Anglo-Saxon in English departments—like whalebone in a corset, as a stiffener to an otherwise spineless subject. That appraisal does justice neither to the intrinsic interest of both Anglo-Saxon and modern linguistics, nor to the toughness of literary study in itself.

We are also thinking more about ways of assessing students. On the whole we have tended to assess them by a final examination of eight to ten papers at the end of their third year (or divided the examination into a Part I after two years and a Part II after three years). I once read at roughly the same time the syllabuses of all university English departments in Great Britain.

Some require their students to chew through their final papers in great period pieces, munching steadily from *Beowulf* up to T. S Eliot. Some have, say, an Essay paper or a Genre paper or a Great Authors paper or a Literature and Society paper; and, in one or two places, there is a small dissertation in place of one paper. There is some variety. But on the whole not much. Too many departments require the student to show roughly the same kind of ability—chiefly memory and the calculating powers of an insurance broker. There is simply not sufficient variety in kinds of assessment as an integral part of final gradings, and there are other signs of change.

I believe that in some English departments, the actual number of First-Class Honors degrees has remained roughly the same no matter how many students there are in a Final year (this may, of course, also be true of other departments). If this is so, there may be good reasons for it, which would be useful to *know*. Until we do—and an inquiry is about to start—one cannot help wondering whether some teachers' rough and subconscious rule-of-thumb is that they have always given one First-class degree a year in that department, and one First-class degree a year it shall be no matter how many finalists there are.

In graduate work two developments are becoming clear. One is the increase in, and increasing professionalization of, graduate work of the normal kind, graduate work by research thesis. We need that: we have often been amateurish and can learn from the Americans at their best, particularly about collaborative work. I hope we can manage to do this and yet steer clear of them at their worst, of the empty professionalism of some of their graduate schools.

The other development—very new, very confused, and very interesting—is in courses of graduate instruction. These have been encouraged by the decision of the Department of Education and Science to award a new kind of graduate grant, specifically for higher degrees by instruction. The graduate courses already proposed in response are a strange lot. Some are particularly interesting proposals for interdisciplinary courses; others are some hasty, half-baked concoctions. But the latter are just as likely to come from those who originally opposed this development, on the grounds that it would wreck the standards of graduate work, as from those who urged it; and the carefully conceived courses come from both sides, too. I think this is a good new branch of work, and here, too, we can and should learn from the best American practice.

All this is interesting but of minor importance before another group of questions which today, more than ever, faces English departments. I can best approach them by recalling that the great majority of our students have traditionally become teachers (often grammar school teachers, who taught their pupils the kind of English needed to enter the university so that they could become grammar school teachers, too, and teach their pupils the kind of English needed . . .).

To some extent this is still so. But nowadays government grants are not so much tied to the intention of teaching school; more parents have more money to allow their children to experiment with possible vocations; students do not feel that fear of unemployment which tended to haunt our generation and made us look to school teaching as a safe anchorage.

Still they come to read English in great numbers. Why? Because English is a soft option? Because it has been promoted by their school teachers, chiefly out of habit? Because the students think it opens interesting or lucrative doors in the democracies of commercial persuasion? Because they feel, without being able to explain why, that English matters? We do not know the answers. I argued earlier that, in those decades when most of our students sought to become teachers, we did not think enough about the implications of this situation for our own work. How much more do we need to think of these things now when the situation is so confused.

Even if we knew the reasons why the students choose to come, it would not in itself make us change by one jot the way we teach, or alter our view of how the teaching of literature is to be justified. Many students might have chosen literature for what we think are wrong reasons. In that case, would they have done better to go elsewhere? It would be better to think about these questions now so that, at the least, if we still refuse to change, we know more surely why we do refuse. Things are moving fast, and new lines soon set hard. If we do not decide for ourselves, matters may be decided for us in ways we like less and less.

We are being challenged to think more about the individual and social meanings of the study of literature. Some of the newer technical universities and institutes of higher education seem confident that they know these meanings better than the traditional universities, but they usually seem to be talking not about the proper study of literature but about unquestioned technocratic applications of English.

We have to ask ourselves what is the *peculiar* quality of literature and therefore of the study of literature. It does not lie in historical scholarship and in textual expertness, which are irreplaceable but are not unique; they are shared with other disciplines. What is unique to literature is, first, a *peculiar engagement with language* and, second, a *peculiar relation to experience*. In Auden's phrase, literature is a "game of knowledge"; it has its own forms (the "game"), and you will not understand it if you do not respond to its forms in themselves; but it is also a witness to the quality of life, the exploration and evaluation of human experience (that is, about "knowledge").

This paradox, which points at the same time both away from everyday life and right to its core, is the heart of the matter, and we cannot reasonably ignore its implications. The need is simple, but dauntingly simple since it has so many dangers: we need to think much more about making connections, the right kind of connections between our subject and personal and social experience. Parenthetically, that is why I am glad that some of the new universities have experimented (I think of Sussex in particular).

There are more bad connections than good; there are ditches on both sides of the road. But the knowledge that we can fall heavily when tackling a difficult question is not good reason to ignore it; it underlines the question's importance. Talking about the relation of literature to personal experience risks several kinds of crudeness, from sentimentality to heavy moralizing. Talking about literature as a criticism of the quality of social life risks encouraging students to become mild and ineffectual dissidents whom society can easily absorb, since their criticism is not adequate to the complexity of either society's ills or its virtues. Concentrating on a disconnected professionalism helps turn out smooth operators who use and abuse their literary training in one or other of the new mass manipulative trades. By ignoring the problems altogether, on the grounds that you are a pure scholar, you are achieving peace at the cost of evading the important challenges of the subject.

There must be other ways, ways in which we can help our students to understand better both the manner in which language works through literature and literature's qualitative engagement with experience. Such an environment need cause no loss of scholarship itself nor dereliction of scholarly standards throughout. There ought to be very good teaching, teaching disciplined by respect for the difficulty of the questions posed, the difficulty of understanding just how experience is explored within the intractable literary "thisness" of poetry and drama and fiction.

If we do not try to make these connections, it would be more honest to reduce our departments, to make them a little larger than the usual Latin department—just about big enough to keep up scholarship in the subject and provide a few grammar school teachers who are specialists. Numbers today are much bigger than that, and these numbers have to be justified—not so much before society but out of respect for our own subject.

Remarks Inspired by Professor Hoggart's "The Scope of English Studies in British Universities"

George L. Anderson

When the first space ship landed on Mars, it contained among its crew members a team—a joint NCTE, National Association for the Teaching of English, MLA team—to evaluate advanced programs in Stellarenglish. It announced the following discoveries: the programs at least in the older institutions are of the highest quality, but pressure of increasing enrollment has created problems which the universities have not yet faced. Historical scholarship has gradually given way to criticism. The intimate relationship that once existed between student and mentor is threatened by large numbers of students many of them supported by government fellowships. Graduate programs on Mars, it was noted, are uniformly conservative, and though adequate data are not available to assess relative quality, scholars are convinced that quality shines forth. The faculties of English departments on Mars have always known they have been training teachers, but most have paid little attention to this fact. They have concentrated on the production of scholars, and there is agreement that they have succeeded in keeping up a superior level of scholarship. Little concern has been shown for the techniques of teaching, which are supposed to come to the student by the examples he sees on the lecture platform or engages in debate with in seminars and tutorials. Nor has the new teacher any particular acquaintance with the backgrounds, educational and otherwise, of the students who will sit in his first class. Undergraduate programs were often experimental and original but no adequate data were available. The joint NCTE-NATE-MLA committee transmitted its report to the proper authorities on Mars with some misgivings, but it was enthusiastically received and resulted, as you all know, in the creation of EMCE, the Earth-Mars Council on English.

Some of the above observations are paraphrases or mild distortions of material in Professor Hoggart's report on "The Scope of English Studies in British Universities," but they could just as well have come from a library of articles and speeches made over the last few years on various aspects of English education in the United States. The general outlines of our mutual problems are clear enough: defining the nature of the traditional graduate program, the relationship of graduate study to teaching and particularly to teacher training, the nature of the English major, the nature of the most elementary college course in English, the knowledge and competencies of the entering college student (i.e., what happens in high school and before that), and the pressure of the Golden Horde of new bodies. I have excluded from this list at least one of Professor Hoggart's most interesting comments—the relationship between the academic's claim as to literature's function and the realities of twentieth century society—because the problem is different in the United States than it is in England and I should like to treat it separately.

It would seem that we have good reasons to establish an international camaraderie on mutual problems. For one thing, it is strangely comforting to mankind to find that what seem to be the same problems exist all over the world even if they cannot be solved. I should therefore like to anticipate the feeling of accomplishment that we will all inevitably have by predicting the limits of the present meeting and suggesting some lines of investigation for the future. Before I come to what I have and have not learned from Professor Hoggart's report, I shall begin with a recent project of my own which demonstrates conclusively how a brilliant mind by prodigious effort, at considerable expense, and with expert assistance can produce a detailed analysis of one aspect of English education that proved wholly useless in solving problems. More than a year ago, the Modern Language Association did, under my direction, a survey of English Ph.D. requirements in some seventy American institutions. The sixteen page questionnaire seemed adequate in that it encouraged little of the marginalia that result from badly phrased questions. It covered all aspects of the Ph.D. in English—entrance requirements, courses, the nature of and sequence of examinations, foreign language requirements, time limits, seminars, the dissertation, and libraries and other matters. What it seemed to demonstrate is that Ph.D. requirements are uniform the length and breadth of the land and that they are quite conservative—something which was always suspected. But what the survey really proved is that one cannot learn something significant about the Ph.D. in English by studying the requirements quantitatively. Clearly not all programs are equally good. Nor is it at all difficult to get academics to rate programs. I can remember a session late at night in a smoke-filled room at which a small group of scholars and teachers rattled off in short order and with virtually no debate the thirty-five or so programs which they judged superior to everything else in the country. They would have had a hard time defining the basis of their selection, but I have much more faith in it than in any questionnaire I have seen.

To put Professor Hoggart's report in this context, I must begin by saying that his own career in the teaching of English and his contacts with its leaders in England make even his conjectures authoritative, just as the instincts of Sir Herbert Davis on the canon of Swift are likely to outweigh the most diligent proofs of the novice. What is tantalizing about the report is that the American reader, at least, cannot easily imagine the context of the generalizations. Furthermore, if Professor Hoggart has really comprehensive data on English education in England, then England is far ahead of the United States. Let us focus for a moment on just three important things: the undergraduate and graduate student's knowledge of literary history, his ability to think and write critically, and his ability or potential ability to present literary material to a layman or to a class effectively. What is the state of the knowledge of literary history of the beginning Oxbridge student? How effective a critic is he, by whatever standard? Is he ever asked—and this is the beginning of wisdom in teaching—how he would explain the nature of a literary work to a layman, or is it ever suggested to him in any way that an English specialization may result in his teaching? After these questions are asked about Oxbridge, we can ask them about the other kinds of British universities. I am not against doing what some poorer institutions have always done, defining goals in terms of current practices and not in terms of ideals. However defined, this is the next question. What are the aims and objectives of the educational program prior to the arrival of the student at Oxbridge or a London college or a Scottish or Welsh university? At the other end of the program, what is the graduate supposed to know and what competencies is he supposed to have when he ends his education and goes into the world (including into a teaching position)?

We cannot answer one of these questions adequately in the United States for English education as a whole; I doubt that a single American institution has a clearly articulated answer to any of them. In short, we do not have the data, and without them any comparisons with education in England may be a matter of comparing apples with oranges. For instance, I suspect that British students know more literary history than American students. When the New Criticism inundated our colleges, far too much history and too little literature was taught in our courses. The pendulum swung the other way, and today it is probably a minority group which studies in any course the whole of English literature chronologically.

Some general introduction to literary forms is a component in many freshman level courses, and various approaches to great masterpieces is often the second level course—not necessarily masterpieces of English. These courses are of great variety. I can recall with horror a freshman course in which the readings were limited to the Western hemisphere, and I found myself being forced to talk about the gauchos of the Argentine in comparison with similar equestrian antics in our own West. Fortunately my final graduate course for my Ph.D. in English was one in the History of the Byzantine Empire and Arab World, and I was able to make meaningful comparisons with the Mongol nomads, semi-literate brigands on horseback being much the same the world over.

I can recall also the trauma of having to prepare to teach the *Odyssey*, the Old Testament, and *Faust*, in a single semester. I doubt that there is anything comparable to this in the British educational system. The British student may study a narrower range of materials and do it better. He may learn more literary history (if that is desirable) because of the conservatism of the system or because he feels it is closer to his own heritage, or he may not. These are things I cannot determine from Professor Hoggart's address.

That the American student does not feel compelled to learn the literary history of a country which is his cultural and spiritual ancester may be to his advantage. He is likely to ask why a work is worth reading and to demand that its value be proved. He does not feel compelled to read *Paradise Lost* any more than he does to read *Crime and Punishment*.

What I am hinting at is that Professor Hoggart has provided us with a paper, and what we need is a book or several books. What seem to be similar problems in our respective educational systems may not in fact be the same. Even if they are not the same, knowing something about them may be very useful to us. The fluidity of the American educational system and the autonomy of our institutions make it possible to pattern a program on a British model if such a model seems particularly attractive. Our British friends, I may add parenthetically, know much more about us than we do about them. What I propose is exchange of information on a wide scale and massive data collecting. We have already under way or completed some major studies of English education. Professor Donald Sears has recently reported on a study of graduate English. Professors William Viall, Michael Shugrue, and Eldonna Evertts are launching a joint NCTE-MLA-NASDTEC study on the preparation of teachers of English. The American Council on Education will shortly release an evaluation—a ranking—of graduate English programs in the United States. Although the ranks will probably be scaled from "extraordinarily superior" to "minimally superior," no one will be fooled by this and the fur will fly. But we still very much need what has been planned for a long while—a comprehensive survey of all of the components in English education, a project which will require much money and much sophistication in data processing. Such a survey will and must come about, and it is likely to be done soon. We need something similar for England where it may be an easier task—if the programs are more of a pattern.

A valuable but less ambitious form of international cooperation than comparing comprehensive surveys would be to send a team of Americans to an English institution for a year to make a study in depth. They would sit with their British colleagues as they lectured, held tutorials, and constructed examinations. They would sit as examinations were graded. They would investigate the preuniversity education of the students. The students might be experimentally given some American tests, both the nationally administrated and professionally created kind and the classroom, homemade variety.

Such an investigation of course would not necessarily tell us about English education as a whole. It would have to be conducted with tact. The investigators would have to be aware that we do not have a common language but an uncommon one that frequently lulls us into thinking we understand our overseas colleagues when in fact we do not. The students would have to be assured that they were not in double jeopardy. The conclusions of the study would have to be announced with intelligence. It will do us no good, for instance, to find that British students are ahead of American students unless we find out in what way, and with what limitations, and how this came to be. I assume that the British are not born ahead of the rest of us. Such a study as I have outlined here would have great value, I think, for all of us. I say this without being able to predict what it would accomplish. Again, I am reading between the lines of Professor Hoggart's paper.

A third type of confrontation, and one even more economical and immediately feasible, is for those of us concerned with standards in freshman English, in undergraduate programs, in the graduate program, and in teacher training to subject our standards to the scrutiny of our British colleagues and conversely, to try to understand the rationale for the British examination system. Many of us would be interested in a report entitled "The Preparation of College Teachers in Modern Foreign Languages" published in *PMLA* in May 1964, because much of it is applicable to general graduate training and also because it represents an attempt to make a profession of highly individualistic people who are articulate in more than one language agree on principles. They do not all agree, of course, and criticism of this document has been widespread. But the report is signed by a committee of leaders and—and this is most important in the Modern Language Association—by a committee which cannot be faulted for not producing scholarship.

A most interesting debate could take place on the more recent policy statement on the Ph.D. in English. It is brief enough for me to read it in its entirety:

> In view of the activities in which most Ph.D.'s in English engage, we recommend that the degree be considered as preparation both for teaching and scholarship, and the postdoctoral fellowships be provided for those who are especially concerned with research and writing.
>
> Pursuant to these objectives:
>
> 1) The Ph.D. program, including supervised teaching, should be so constructed that full-time students will complete it in no more than four years beyond the baccalaureate.
>
> 2) The dissertation should be regarded as a demonstration of scholarly and rhetorical ability. It may take the form of a collection of separate studies.
>
> 3) The foreign language requirement may be satisfied by the demonstration of ability to understand, speak, and read one

> modern foreign language well or read one classical language well, and by some knowledge of the major literature of the language in the original.
>
> 4) The basis for doctoral study should be a reasonable coverage of literature in English with a concentration in one or more areas. In addition to this coverage, the student's individual program should be so designed that his undergraduate and graduate education shall have included (a) literary and rhetorical theory, and criticism; (b) bibliographical, textual, and other techniques of scholarship; (c) the nature of language.
>
> 5) Employment of the doctoral candidate in instructional duties should be restricted to his useful training as a teacher and should not be prolonged beyond the point at which it ceases to serve this purpose.

It is signed, again, by people whose scholarship is impeccable—chairmen of large university departments like Columbia, Indiana, Illinois, and New York University, smaller state institutions, small private colleges, and two-year colleges. It is a controversial document, and it will be interesting to see if the chairmen who created it will be able to get their own departments to adopt it. Policy statements and guidelines, fathered by necessity, born in pain, and frequently regarded as illegitimate, are coming into being in our atomistic educational society, and they would benefit from the criticism of our overseas colleagues.

I want finally to touch on Professor Hoggart's comments on literature and society because what I feel may be a conspicuous difference between the British and American teacher—the young teacher—may be here. I quote from his paper:

> The students live in and go out to teach in a society whose relation to the humane values which literature explores is intensely difficult to define, which uses language increasingly as a tool or a weapon rather than as a means to truth. The clash between our claims for literature's function and the reality–and, often, between the model of high culture we have offered our students and the nature of their family and neighborhood life–has been extreme. But we have left them to sort things out for themselves or to remain split. Sometimes the clash has seemed more extreme than it actually is, but we have given no help in either stressing genuine distinctions or suggesting possible connections.[1]

I do not know if American organizers of freshman English courses ever consciously identify this problem, discuss it with the beginning teachers, and make it articulate in the classroom, but there is a tradition of a great amount of social content in the beginning course and also one of allowing the students to draw from their own experience for papers. Our difficulty has frequently been that miscellaneous social concerns have pushed literature and especially writing aside. A decade ago, at any rate, it was not difficult to find freshman courses—complete with the usual number of themes—that scarcely discussed writing. I speak with feeling, since I once became chairman of a freshman program which taught liberalism the first semester and the New Criticism the second, and it was very difficult to persuade the staff to grapple with anything as elementary as the uses of English. Our first year college course is usually taught by a young man inspired by the belief that he is an intellectual (I will not speak of his training) and delighted by the presence of a captive audience. If he is not carefully supervised, he will spend his time on cybernetics, Vietnam, Goldwaterism, and the theatre of the absurd. Liberal wars are won, in the United States, on the playing fields of the freshman English course. The class is the only small class many students have during their first years in college and the only one likely to permit much discussion. Our problem here, besides training, is not that the young teacher regards himself as a guardian of high literary culture unrelated to his students' lives, but that we cannot inspire in him a passion for rhetoric as compelling as his other passions. Yet Professor Hoggart's words lead us to ask just what the relationship between literature and society is in our programs and what we think it ought to be. This includes even the question of whether or not we expect the student to read literature after he leaves school or whether we will be satisfied if he wears his Shakespeare and his Keats with pride, but something like lace cuffs.

---

[1] See Richard Hoggart, "The Scope of English Studies in British Universities, p. 163.

President Lyndon Johnson's Smithsonian address on international corporation announced the broadest possible international involvement in all areas—from agriculture and technology to the arts and humanities, and not confined to the developing countries. We in the Modern Language Association and the National Council of Teachers of English must make ourselves heard to the President, to the Congress, and to the National Citizens Committee organizing these future activities. The leaders of our government should feel the urgency of our need for the kind of international exchange that we have so well begun at this meeting, be apprised of the variety of the problems that have been unearthed, and be told modestly but firmly that this is the group to do the work.

English and the Training of Teachers

Andrew Wilkinson

The Organization of Teacher Training

This is not the place to describe in detail the formal organization of teacher training in England and Wales. A little must be said about the matter, however, as the training is carried out in two distinct types of institution—the teacher training colleges, now renamed colleges of education, and the university departments of education.

The colleges of education, of which there are 169, take school leavers, at eighteen plus, and give them a three year course of personal and professional education. The university education departments, of which there are 24, take only graduates from their own or other universities (at Birmingham the figure is about 50:50) who have taken a bachelor's degree after three years of specialist study, and give them a one year course to prepare them for teaching. The responsibility for the education provided in both types of institution belongs to an Area Training Organization which is centered on a university and is usually known as an Institute of Education. These institutes vary in size: London covers two U.D.E.'s and 34 C. of E.'s; Leicester, one U.D.E. and two C. of E.'s. Each institute is governed by a council representing the university, the colleges of education, the local authority, and teachers' associations. Academic matters are decided by a board composed mainly or entirely of university and college staff, advised by subject committees on which subject specialists from the various colleges sit. The association of the Area Training Organization with the universities is greatly prized because it guarantees academic freedom. Most of the colleges belong to the local education authority concerned, others to independent (usually religious) bodies; but these bodies do not determine the curriculum. The university institute awards a Certificate in Education to both types of student upon the successful completion of the course concerned, and this is accepted by the licensing body, the (government) Department of Education and Science, as conferring "qualified teacher status."

The institutes also have a responsibility for inservice training. They provide courses of evening lectures; weekend schools, or vacation courses lasting a week or ten days. Similar courses are provided by the Department of Education and Science, by various local education authorities; and by the teachers unions, particularly the National Union of Teachers. The institutes also provide a certain number of full-time sessional courses for teachers with some minimum length of service, to which they may be seconded on full salary by their local authority. On the whole, however, far too little inservice training is done in the United Kingdom; and the university subject schools and education departments have a much larger part to play as sources of continual renewal. This is a field in which we must expand considerably.

The general pattern of teacher training in the college of education may be exemplified from the Birmingham Institute. Students must take education (its philosophy, psychology, history, and sociology); two subject courses, one or both at principle level; appropriate professional courses (on the methods of teaching); and carry out certain stipulated periods of teaching practice in schools. The regulations require English as a compulsory professional subject for all students; and the colleges in fact go further than this: professional English includes not only methods of teaching English but the students' own training in English. Students entering the university education department on the other hand have already had three years of subject-based education. They come to be introduced to education as a discipline; to learn the principles and methods of teaching their subject and to gain experience of the classroom situation. In neither institution can the study of education be very advanced at this stage; it will not be concerned for the students to make basic discoveries. Rather will it apply itself to the curriculum problem: How does one help pupils to learn what they need to learn? Psychology supplies insights into the learning and methods; principles, history, and sociology into the needs and purposes as defined in personal and social terms.

The Equipment of the English Specialist

And the future teachers of English—what is our training aiming at with them? Of course, they ought to be well-balanced people possessing passion and judgment, knowledgeable about their subject, able to establish good relationships with their pupils and communicate with them. But these are qualities which one hopes for in teachers of any subject. What particular qualities over and above these should we aim to make the special equipment of the English teacher? At the risk of being foolhardy, I will attempt to list these:

1. VERBALIZATION OF EXPERIENCE

He must have in peculiar degree *the ability to verbalize his experience.* The verbalization is encouraged in many colleges of education by requiring him to produce creative writing as well as analytical and descriptive essays. This is also done in some university education departments; for instance, in my own department the student is asked to express and interpret his own experience in a piece of autobiographical or other personal writing. The verbalization must however inevitably go on predominantly in the spoken word, since this is the staple of our communication. This is greatly aided by the organization of classes in teacher training in England; they are tutorially based with one tutor having responsibility for a group of eight or ten students who meet regularly. The number of lectures vis-a-vis tutorials is less than in the average university degree course. It should be said however that the spoken language has been badly neglected in English education; only now is this beginning to be realized and remedied. Where speech has been attended to at all, it has too often been in the form of "speech training" or "elocution" concerned with accent change, rather than with efficient and appropriate communication. At Birmingham we have suggested that a new term, *oracy,* on a parallel with *literacy,* is needed for the skills of speaking and listening to give them focus and status. The opposite of *oracy* is *inoracy:* one who has these skills is *orate,* one who lacks them *inorate.*[1] In teacher training we have yet to develop the orate potential of our students.

The future English teacher should be equipped with this verbalizing skill for many reasons: for his own needs at many levels; because of the importance of the adult child dialogue in developing children's language and intelligence, particularly in the early years; because of the importance of the adult model at all times; because teaching is a reciprocal process.

---

[1] A. M. Wilkinson, A. Davies, D. Atkinson, *Spoken English.* Educational Review Occasional Publication No. 2 (Birmingham, England: University Education Department, 1965).

2. AWARENESS OF THE CREATIVE PROCESS

A further reason that English students must have this ability to verbalize experience is that eventually they will require it of their pupils. *The English teacher must be aware of the nature of* the *creative process.* As Nancy Martin writes in *NATE Bulletin*, the English teacher training course "aims primarily at making students aware of the linguistic processes that lie behind thinking and creating in words and of the psychological limitation that immaturity sets on your children. Its method is for the students to use language themselves in as many forms as possible. . . ."[2] And the creative process starts with experience; nothing can come of nothing. Perhaps I ought to feel apologetic for laboring the obvious. Unfortunately this elementary understanding of the nature of creation is what English teachers have signally lacked.

In the past there has been a pattern of teaching based on exercises in the belief that this was the fundamental means of producing effective writing in the pupils. Perhaps the saddest story in the history of English teaching concerned the divorce between what was known and what was practiced in the matter of grammar. In 1903, the pioneering American research worker, J. M. Rice, conducted experiments which suggested that a knowledge of formal grammar was of no benefit to children in their writing. Similar experiments were repeated by other workers, so that by 1929, when R. L. Lyman published his *Summary of Investigations,* it was only possible to maintain that formal grammar was helpful in this way in ignorance (or defiance) of the facts. Since then the research has continued unabated, always with the same conclusions. Similar research has been carried out concerning other types of exercise (spelling, punctuation, etc.), and the transfer is seen to be limited or nonexistent. Yet this type of work has been encouraged by textbooks and examinations and has far too often become the main fare of the English lesson.

The job of the English teacher here is something quite other. It lies in the ability to construct situations which compel the verbalization of experience as the necessary response. Thus the encouragement of oracy does not lie in the practicing of speech and listening in and for themselves, but predominantly in the provision of reciprocal speech situations, whether these are real, as when a pupil conducts a visitor round the school, or fabricated as when in "child drama" (which I believe Americans call "creative dramatics") a "housewife" answers the door to a "vacuum cleaner salesman." Scheherazade was commanded: "Communicate or perish," and a thousand and one nights did not exhaust her discourse. There is a sense in which we must all communicate or perish.

---

[2] N. Martin, "Training English Teachers in a University Department of Education," *NATE Bulletin,* II (1965), 3.

3. KNOWLEDGE OF LANGUAGE

Further, the *English teacher should know about language;* he should have a sense of its nature, uses, and varieties. Psychologists have shown us its crucial function in the acquisition of intelligence; sociologists, the relationships of the learner's language use to the linguistic codes and attitudes in the home; sociolinguists, the part played by content, situation, and status of participants in the forms of language used; linguists have demonstrated the inadequacy of previous descriptions of language in terms of the old grammars and are proposing new descriptions. Certainly student teachers have had for many years an acquaintance in their psychology courses with the language/thought/intelligence relationships mainly through the work of Piaget. The linguistic studies are newer and have yet to take their rightful place in many colleges. This does not mean that all students should become linguists, much less that they should attempt to teach linguistics to main school pupils (it could be for them as dangerous as the old grammar we have cast off with such travail). It does mean, however, that they should be acquainted with the attitudes towards language introduced by linguistics, particularly an awareness of situational rather than absolute correctness, which has important implications for teaching and particularly for oracy. Though sometimes seen as being opposed to it, this work, rightly conceived, is complementary to the "discrimination" treatment of popular culture which Denys Thompson helped to originate and has advocated for many years. The linguist, as a scientist, makes no value judgments; he does not say no value judgments are to be made.

4. SENSE OF LITERATURE

The quality believed to distinguish the English teacher, however, is *his knowledge of and sensitivity to literature.* This I assume we all accept, and so much has been written of the value of literature in education that I will look at it briefly. Literature is the body of experience on which the teacher can draw for all his teaching and out of which his own experience is formed in some measure. Certainly in the training of English teachers literature figures prominently. The Honors English Bachelor of Arts (in the College of Education) is a three year program for the student who, taking it as a main subject, will probably read in several periods, as well as go more deeply into a specific one, and also carry out a special study. It is impossible to generalize about the various courses. One college of education syllabus states: "Reading, where feasible, begins with the authors of the present day, using idiom and material that are reasonably familiar. Later the student with more maturity and scholarship will read from such giants of the past as speak directly to the present." A college a few miles away however states: "The center of the course will be a close study of one specified period of English literature chosen from the following." It then lists six conventional periods: the first is 1558-1625; the last, 1830-1890. These two examples reveal how impossible it is to generalize about the various courses, though it would be fair to say that the usual aim in the Honors Schools and in most colleges is depth rather than comprehensiveness.

5. ROLES AND RELATIONSHIPS

The student has been a student for most of his life; an important function of teacher training is to aid his adjustment to new *roles and relationships.* This adjustment is accomplished largely in the schools themselves, where the student is practice teaching. Each student has a personal tutor who visits him, and the students return frequently to the training institution to assess their experiences in discussion. The departments and colleges have built up relationships over many years with schools; some of them appoint outstanding teachers at these schools to supervise school practice, such teachers meeting regularly with the college tutor for discussion. Where NATE groups are functioning in association with a department or college, one has immediately a body of enthusiastic teachers whom the students may meet first on a social level, and whose schools provide an invaluable network where a tutor may be sure of wise and sympathetic help for his students.

The student should think critically about his future role as an English teacher. The group pressures for conformity in a staff room are inevitably great: he may assume, all unconsciously, a role which may render him less effective as a teacher. The following are some roles which are to be found.

a. The Teacher as Grendel's Mother. The conception of the teacher as guardian of the world-hoard is a view as old as Plato. Literature is the great treasure, a "heritage"; it "enshrines the values of a people"; it is the famous stone which changeth all to golden lads and girls. The strengths of such an idea are obvious, but the weaknesses are several. There is an unwillingness to temper the treasure to the unfleeced child (seen in the predominance of "established classics," a hostility to shortened versions, a narrowing of the canon). There is an unwillingness to consider other ways to truth than the word, to examine critically the claims made for literature as an educative influence. There is a denial that literature has any other value than its literary value (noticeable in the exclusive treatment of drama as a "text" and in a distrust of psychologically inspired movements in this field).

b. The Teacher as Sergeant-Major. This is the concept of English as a "discipline." The body-mind analogy is in the fundamental image here, with a vocabulary of "exercises" and "drill" (there is a book called *Keep-Fit Exercises in English;* another called *English on Parade*). Perhaps, today, few subscribe consciously to the ancient belief that one can discipline the mind in this way, yet it lurks as an assumption in much English language work which, lacking intrinsic interest, will yet "do the pupil good." Perhaps also the more recent descriptions of literature as "the essential discipline" where "discipline" means basically a body of study, rather than some quantity capable of indefinite generalization, has yet given the old concept from a discredited faculty psychology a new life.

c. The Teacher as Sigmund Freud. Psychoanalysis has been a strong influence, particularly in the teaching of composition. That hitherto harmless looking exercise book has become a document of the soul expressing its deeper, darker legends under such allegorical titles as Spring, a Visit to the Seaside, and My Life by a Sixpenny Piece. Analogies from morbid psychology applied to normal situations have obvious dangers. But it is too easy to reject them. They have proved useful in drawing attention to the unconscious processes going on in any really committed writing and their importance for the writer's development—a means of releasing conflicts and tensions, of objectifying and coming to terms with anxieties and hopes under conditions of safety—of interpreting experience. This role, as others, fails when it is taken over too completely, when the exercise book becomes a case book, and when it is forgotten that one of the ends of speaking and writing is communication.

d. The Teacher as Group Psychotherapist. The psychodrama work of J. L. Moreno in which a mentally disturbed patient acts out his problems with the aid of other role players may be said to have been the starting point of the sociodrama and role playing which is now an established drama technique in schools; it is known in America as "creative dramatics" and in England as "free" or "child drama." In the literature of the subject, the role of the teacher as therapist is well to the fore with reference to its "curative value,"[3] but claims for it as an "art" are no less insistent. Its advocates should sometimes remember that it is not all-sufficient, but complementary to the scripted play; for whatever insights are obtained in spontaneous group creation, they are not those of Sophocles and Shakespeare.

e. The Teacher as Printer's Reader. This part requires that the teacher of English regard each piece of work he marks as needing proof correction, so that every mistake must be indicated by an appropriate symbol GRowling, SPitting, hiSSing from the margin. In this way the teacher's spirit dies, the children improve little, but at least the teacher feels he is doing his job conscientiously. And yet the research on marking, and many enlightened marking systems, are there to lighten his burden, to preserve his energies for the creative tasks.

f. The Teacher as "Teacher." This might seem the obvious role, the ideal self-image. Yet in one common connotation it represents the routine figure who has not the initiative to try other roles. This figure reveals himself in cries for "good solid *teaching*" (i.e. facts), in criticism of "frills" (i.e. no facts), and demands that the pupil shall "really learn something" (i.e. facts). He has the support of many parents ("they don't *teach* them anything nowadays") and many headmasters ("best exam results in the area"). He likes grammar, and has his own seat in the staff room.

And so one could go on. The worst roles are pernicious and should be rejected. But even the best are limited, and the good teacher makes his choice as need arises, though not in any conscious way. The way I have presented these roles should not lead anyone to believe that I think this is a trivial matter. These purposes could have been stated as principles of education, as beliefs. I have stated them in terms of roles or self-images because this is how these purposes are translated into action. But whatever terms are used, teacher training has a prime function to raise the issues. Here the student has a chance to evaluate his visits to and work in different schools and by reference to the doctrines of his tutors (which indeed he may reject completely) in a way that will probably not be possible again.

---

[3] P. Slade, *Introduction to Child Drama* (London: University of London Press, 1958).

English and the Nonspecialist Teacher

1. ALL TEACHERS

So far I have been discussing the training of the specialist English teacher. But my subject, wider than this, is English and the training of teachers. As I have said, in colleges of education the rule is that all students take some English, though inevitably the conviction with which this is done on the part of both staff and students varies considerably. No university education department that I am aware of offers the subject "English" in any form, though sometimes English methodology and drama are generally available as options. Yet it would seem that a course, perhaps entitled Language Communications (call it what you will —its subject is man's primary artifact), could be the central synthesizing agent for the various studies at present taught under the name of education and become a meeting point for both arts and science students. It would have psychological, sociological, linguistic, anthropological, philosophical references; but it would essentially be a study of the contemporary language in use. Such a course has not yet been devised in England, but it appears to be one of the tasks facing us in teacher training.

2. THE NONSPECIALIST ENGLISH TEACHER

There is yet another matter to consider: one brought forcibly to our attention by Professor Boris Ford at the NATE Easter conference this year. We have a great shortage of specialist English teachers, and increasingly the teaching of English is being carried out by historians, geographers, sociologists, and mathematicians. Professor Ford pertinently asks, "What, to put the awkward question, do they know of English: What have their disciplines to contribute to the study of English?" Certainly we need to know. Certainly they lack the large acquaintance with a sensitivity to literature which the English specialist should have and which becomes the more important the older the ages of the pupils (though the literature which is suitable for children in our primary and main secondary school is not that which the student meets in his special course). They all need to be taught something of the creative process, of current attitudes to language, of the aims of the subject (which comprise my second, third, and fifth heading above), and we shall find they have a great deal to contribute. We must beware of thinking the barbarians are at the gates.

For one thing, teachers' training in other disciplines, sociology for instance, have bodies of experience on which to draw which the English teacher lacks, the relevance of which to the contemporary world is immediately obvious to children in a way in which so much literature is not, for its myths require interpretation (and here I mean the myths which are in all literature because it is not fact). And again, it is a mistake to think that the verbalization of experience is not a prime and conscious concern in subjects other than English. The geographer interprets landscape—pictorially, diagramatically, cartographically, it is true—but he than requires the verbalization of his picture, diagram, map. This is a normal school teaching technique. It is, however, not only the representation he is interested in interpreting, but the original. Professor H. C. Darby, in his 1962 presidential address to the Institute of British Geographers, "The Problem of Geographical Description," reveals concern, which the geographer has with verbal interpretation. He protests at the confining of description to "verbal cartography," necessary though that is, and speaks of the function of what is called "descriptive geography." This however has been found inadequate: it cannot be complete or objective. He therefore leads us to consider "aesthetic geography" and the nature of the "geographical imagination." The great geographers in fact make their own syntheses which differ considerably from one another; and Professor Darby brings out well the functioning of various verbal modes in geographical writing. And there is another point. For many years geographers have supplemented their teaching with the literature of description. A recent anthology, Margaret Anderson's *Splendour of Earth,* collects descriptions from literature on the belief that "no deadly accurate, purely technical description can bring vividly to life a mountain, a great river, or even a climate, can make it our own to love and remember, as an imaginative description by a great writer can do."[4] English and geography clearly stand in alliance. And if the geographers can bring us the splendors of the earth, we have reason to welcome them with open arms.

---

[4] M. Anderson, *Splendour of Earth* (London: George Philip and Son, Ltd., 1954), p. xxv.

Inevitably I have been describing partly what is in England, partly what I think ought to be, or might be. Inevitably I must have fallen between two stools, but at least the man who has thus fallen finds himself on the floor and is thankful it has held him. It is a convenient place to stop.

Bibliography

Anderson, M. *Splendour of Earth.* London: George Philip and Son, Ltd., 1954.

Darby, H. C. "The Problem of Geographical Description," *Institute of British Geographers Transaction and Papers 1962.* London: George Philip and Son, Ltd., 1962.

Lyman, R. L. *Summary of Investigations Relating to Grammar, Language, and Composition.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1929.

Martin, N. "Training English Teachers in a University Department of Education," *NATE Bulletin,* II (1965), 3.

Rice, J. N. *The Forum* (U.S.A.), October 1903.

Slade, P. *Introduction to Child Drama.* London: University of London Press, 1958.

Wilkinson, A. M., A. Davies, and D. Atkinson. *Spoken English.* Educational Review Occasional Publication No. 2, Birmingham, England: University Education Department, 1965.

Teacher Education in America

Henry C. Meckel

We are grateful indeed to Andrew Wilkinson for his concise but comprehensive treatment of teacher education in England and in Wales. And we are particularly delighted with his description of the English teacher's roles and relationships: the teacher as Grendel's mother, the teacher as Sergeant-major, the teacher as Sigmund Freud, the teacher as printer's reader.

In discussing teacher education in America, I will deal at the beginning with the total context in which American teacher education is developing at the present time. After some general comments on that matter, I will discuss current attempts to improve education at the inservice level and then problems of teacher education at the preservice level.

Constitutionally and by tradition, policy making and educational practices in America are matters left to the individual states. There are thus in this country fifty separate state systems of schools and fifty different sets of laws and practices pertaining to the certification of teachers. With all the possibilities for diversity, American public education still witnesses a surprising amount of uniformity. While individual states set up their own curriculum patterns, the textbook publishing industry has in reality been the strongest single factor determining the actual curriculum patterns and teaching methods. Series of graded textbooks in reading, for example, with supplementary manuals for teachers, may introduce a uniformity in reading instruction that is sufficiently national in scope, so that a complaint that Johnny cannot read becomes a criticism of instructional practices throughout the nation. Likewise a widely adopted series of language textbooks may have a national effect on the teaching of grammar and composition for a generation.

With reference to practices in teacher education and the intricate problems related to educational finance, certain influential groups in the country feel that education is so closely identified with the national interest that policy making in education must be national in scope. One of the current issues in American education, therefore, is how to unify purpose and planning, while at the same time preserving local controls.

Some basic attitudes in America make us look at education somewhat differently than the British do. American public education has always been rooted in the idea that everybody should be educated. The importance of universal instruction in reading was an idea vitalized through its association with the religious ideas of the Reformation and therefore by the Pilgrim and Puritan settlers of Massachusetts. Later the idea of universal education came to be recognized as an essential condition of a democratic state. Educational opportunity has also been identified in the popular mind with economic opportunity. The American public high school was conceived and born as a vocational institution. American education has not therefore had the close association with the humanistic tradition as seems to have been true in England, especially of English education as represented historically by the public schools and Oxford and Cambridge universities, from which come many men of affairs who are responsible for policy making.

Today's virtual entrenchment of the idea of universal education in America is best seen, perhaps, in my home state of California. There we have a great state university, carrying on activities in 100 different localities and enrolling over 100,000 students on its several major campuses. We have in addition several privately endowed universities, a number of religious-connected universities and colleges, and a system of publicly supported state colleges with four- and five-year programs, the largest of which enrolls 23,000 students. Below this system are approximately 70 two-year junior or community colleges. A student, if he is capable, may move from a comprehensive high school through this system of higher institutions. Thus even the community colleges and other colleges may be involved in some way or other with the education of any particular teacher. Everybody in the secondary schools of the state is potentially a college preparatory student in the sense that with a high school diploma, he may continue his education for at least two years beyond the high school. The cost of this educational system has made the quality and financing of education a political issue in the state. This development is being rapidly replicated in other states.

The most important educational change in America within the last two decades, however, has been rapid growth of the idea among economists and business leaders that educational improvement is related to economic growth of the country—an idea that is shared somewhat by leaders in England. The roles played by university research in World War II and technological developments since that time have convinced industrial and government leaders that the education both of producers and consumers is essential and even critical to the economic process. Anyone who wishes to understand American education today should read both *Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth* by Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Myer (1964) and *The Uses of the University* by Clark Kerr (1963).

It is therefore no accident today that great foundations with sources of money from industrial enterprises are so influential in shaping the future of American education or that the political climate in the country should be congenial to the passing of unprecedented educational legislation at the last two Congressional sessions. The important role of the university in industry and government has made preparatory education in the public schools a critical item, as evinced by the Carnegie Foundation's sponsorship of educational policy and the Conant reports on teacher education and the American high school. James Conant is, in a sense, a man symbolic of his times. A scientist, himself, and former president of Harvard University, he has been one of the influential men of the nation who have helped make the American university the handmaiden of industry, technology, and government.

Having set down these general observations about American education, I will turn now to the education of the English teacher. The most momentous developments in American teacher education are taking place at the inservice level through Congressional legislation which provides funds for the continuing education of teachers. The National Defense Education Act, as amended in 1964, added the social studies and English to the subjects eligible for public support and made special provision for reading instruction, for culturally disadvantaged students, and for instructional materials of all kinds. The amendments of 1964 were especially significant because they represented a change in principle: aid for the two subject areas required throughout the curriculum of all pupils. The 1964 legislation represented, therefore, a precedent for federal support of the educational improvement of those students who have been the most difficult to teach.

Of the activities most directly related to the education of teachers, the summer institute programs seem the most promising. They are encouraging cooperation between people in departments of education and professors of English in colleges and universities—remedying an estrangement that has long stood in the way of educational improvements in this country.

Generous provisions are also being made throughout the nation for new instructional materials, and the way is being opened for teaching that relies less on textbooks and is related more closely to the needs of local groups of pupils.

In order to encourage thinking that will help schools to make the most of their federally supported opportunities, the National Council of Teachers of English has recently released two studies—one directed to the improvement of the supervision of high school English departments and the other directed at the improvement of culturally deprived pupils.

The preservice education of teachers is, of course, markedly influenced by developments that affect inservice education. The United States of course faces a dilemma with respect to teacher education. On one hand, since we are extending educational opportunities at all levels and the student population is rapidly increasing, we need more teachers to staff our classrooms. At the same time we are requiring that these teachers be better educated. Many people feel, therefore, that it will require drastic measures to produce enough teachers of quality.

States are attempting to improve the quality of teacher education through legislation altering credential requirements. To provide guidelines, the United States Office of Education has recently appropriated $172,000 for regional and national conferences to bring together leading scholars in English, and specialists in certification and teacher education to develop guidelines for the preparation of elementary and secondary teachers of English, so that certificate standards are neither hastily nor inadequately conceived. The need for such guidelines is shown, for example, in my own state. We recently finished implementing a credential law in all the colleges and universities only to find that over the summer the legislature had passed a new credential bill to remedy deficiencies in the first.

The education of the English teacher is being sharply affected now by the work in this country of linguistic scholars. Recent developments would seem to imply that all elementary teachers will have to take courses in modern grammar and linguistics because of the applications of such studies to the teaching of reading, spelling, grammar, and composition. NCTE surveys indicate that approximately 60 percent of the instructional time in the elementary schools is given over to some aspect of English language teaching.

Experimental curricula developed through government grants also require a higher degree of specialized knowledge at our secondary school levels—grades 7-12 (ages eleven to eighteen). English departments at colleges and universities are being urged to revise their curricula for teachers to include advanced courses in composition and rhetoric, to require more work in the English language and modern grammar, to require a course in criticism, and to reduce historical emphasis in preservice literature courses for teachers. The trend in the country is to reduce the amount of time spent in professional educational courses and to allot more time to departments responsible for academic content. The teachers college is disappearing in America. In my own state, California, it no longer exists.

Certain states are attempting to move toward five-year programs of teacher education. At least twelve states require a fifth year of college work for secondary teachers, and a few require five years for elementary teachers. In my opinion, the shortage of teachers is not likely to make this development widely possible. It is more likely that the probationary period of teachers —the first three years of teaching—will be more and more thought of as part of the total process of teacher education, and that more and more financial assistance will be given young teachers to continue advanced study during the summers.

Governmental Interest in Research in English

Francis A. J. Ianni

In his last speech on education which was, in fact, the last public address he made in Washington before leaving for Texas, President Kennedy remarked that in education "things don't just happen; they are made to happen." Andrew Wilkinson's delightful and informative paper on "English and the Training of Teachers" is a welcome demonstration of the reality of this observation on an international scale. So much of what we have been doing in this country—particularly with money from government—has stressed the development of new curriculum materials designed to produce quality education; so little has been done to ensure quality teaching of these materials, however, that the much heralded "revolution in the curriculum" threatens to end up as a minor coup d'état. As one of my colleagues in "the new establishment" remarks, when other countries are faced with a pressing social problem, there is an uprising; in this country we design a course. In a similar vein, my own son recently evaluated his father's role in the improvement of American education. The United States Office of Education, along with the National Science Foundation, has spent millions of dollars on new mathematics courses, one of which my son took recently. After two weeks of what was obviously growing confusion, he protested: "Father, I know what's wrong with that course that you and the National Science Foundation people spent all the money on; I understand it, the other kids understand it, but the teacher doesn't really understand it." Good teaching, like all exercises in excellence, does not just happen; it is made to happen.

Now, there have been government sponsored programs to improve teaching, but they have had even less visibility and financial commitment than our research programs. Since World War II, the growth in expenditures for research and development in both industry and government has been astonishing.

Yet, education, American's largest industry, an industry which at heart is designed for the exploration of knowledge and the development of human talents—directed toward research less than one tenth of one percent of educational funds in 1964. With the recognition that a scarce amount of attention, money, and prestige has been attached to educational research, one moves to the many problems within the research and development process itself. Included within such a roster is the lack of any large-scale systematic effort to disseminate or otherwise implement the results of research and development to the classroom and/or the community. Only in relatively few cases have scholars and school personnel worked together to produce educational innovation within the framework of the school. Only in rare cases have development efforts involved *real* children and classroom teachers in a meaningful way.

The problem continues to be one of converting new ideas into forms that are usable in the classroom, testing their use in real schools, and diffusing the proved ideas throughout the educational system. These last ten years of research have *not* brought about the far-reaching and much hoped for changes in practice because neither the efforts to innovate nor the arrangement for diffusing the products of innovation have been developed on a scale that even approaches the need. And this is probably truer of English than of any other field.

All this is not to say that educational research in the field of English has been a failure, or that we should concentrate all of our resources on product-oriented development research. Basic research in the field of education has been successful in producing a significant body of results, but researchers involved in this "discovery" and of the process do not and probably should not devote their time to development engineering tasks. In the early years of federal support for research, the major emphasis was, and I think should have been, on the establishment of a sound program of basic project-oriented research. This project approach served well as a means of establishing a firm base for the development of ideas, but it was not a framework within which these ideas could be developed, tested, and diffused. The realization that research must be articulated into practice, just as educational practices must be based upon sound research findings, is certainly not a novel one, but the need for programing research and development resources which lead to engineering solutions that can be evaluated and be made available becomes greater every day. Today, after two and one half years of experimentation and reorganization, at least the possibilities for financial support for this type of research-development, evaluation, and diffusion exist within the Cooperative Research Program of the Office of Education.

With the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, a whole new world of possibilities opened for educational experimentation and innovation. Titles III, IV and V have important research and development components. Title III authorizes the establishment by local communities of supplementary educational services and facilities where exemplary programs developed through research may be displayed. Title V will greatly strengthen the research and curriculum capabilities of state departments of education. But it is in Title IV of the act that educational research, development, and innovation receive the greatest attention.

Title IV amends the Cooperative Research Act of 1954 and authorizes the expansion of present research and development programs. It does this by adding grant as well as contract authority, by extending the authority of the program to use the research competence of a variety of groups and individuals presently excluded from active participation in the use of Office of Education funds, and by testing new programs to disseminate the results of research.

Each of these additions to the program is an essential one. Expanded authority to use grants as well as contracts will help to implement the possibilities of making grants to English teachers to work on creative development of new approaches to teaching; and we can now call on a variety of organizations, professional societies, private research groups, and even industry, as well as colleges, universities, and state departments of education, to work on educational problems.

The specific inclusion of the term "dissemination" in the program's authorization makes this an explicit mission and allows for the exploration of a variety of new means of getting out the word on research results. And to us, at least, teacher training plays a central role in the diffusion of new ideas in education. Nowhere is the need for more and better trained research personnel so critical as in education, and at long last it will be possible to support pre- and postdoctoral training programs, research internships, and institutes, as well as an undergraduate research participation program. In this training, we will concentrate to a large degree on the development of the educational researcher. Let me emphasize that in this context, educational researcher means the economist, anthropologist, English specialist, as well as the educational psychologist. Perhaps the most exciting thing in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as far as research is concerned, is the recognition that research in education is part of a continuous process of experimentation and innovation which must involve the *schools* as well as the laboratory, and the *teacher* as well as the researcher. Title IV of the Act authorizes a sum of $100 million over the next five years for constructing and equipping national and regional research facilities. These national and regional "laboratories" (as we call them) are being created with the intent to help correct many of the limitations of our present approach to research and development. They will hopefully be a mechanism by which research and development will make its contribution to, and its impact on, the schools and the education system as a whole. Research will still be an important function of the laboratories, but new emphasis will be placed on developing research results into forms that can be used in the classroom, on continuous testing of these forms, on training teachers in their use, and on making these results available to the school system.

The laboratory program calls for the involvement of the educational systems at many levels; for example, state departments of education, local school systems, institutions of higher education, community resources, and private research organizations. This broadly based cooperative structure is unprecedented in the educational world, and the possibilities it opens for cooperative planning and action are almost unlimited. Researchers and teachers have not talked to one another as frequently, as trustfully, or as openly as they should; state education agencies have not engaged in dialogue with the researchers, the teachers, or the teacher education institutes.

The laboratory program is based on the assumption that only when these groups establish a true working relationship will educational improvement occur on a significant scale. The program relies upon a new kind of regional coordination, a dialogue between areas and people that have heretofore worked independently of each other. It is an opportunity to make clear the dynamic interrelationship between the inner city and its outer arm, the suburbs. If the laboratories fulfill our vision of a broad base of areas and institutions, then they will be able to serve as an actual model for regional and inter-institutional planning in all types of educational activities.

Implicit in the concept of the laboratories is the importance of dissemination. In the context of educational innovation, dissemination means more than merely "spreading" information. Effective dissemination must make innovation available in forms that will be understood, accepted, and used; and it must be integrally related to the process that brings about understanding, acceptance, and use. Its most important medium would seem to be the training of teachers. In Wilkinson's terms, the teacher must come to understand each new practice with "awareness of the creative process" and "knowledge of language."

Involving teachers in the process of innovation goes hand in hand with the development of new materials and techniques. Teachers bring to the development process firsthand knowledge of children. Furthermore, the teacher is the one who must use the products of innovation. He must understand how to use these products, but more than this, he must willingly accept continuous experimentation and innovation in the system in which he operates.

This means that the problem of preparing more teachers (nearly 2,000,000 more during the next decade) is compounded by the necessity to give preservice teachers new kinds of preparation, and also to involve inservice teachers in the process of innovation. Laboratories will be able to contribute to this effort through both their experimental schools and local school systems. They might also develop new materials for preparing teachers and for teachers of teachers. Laboratories would also have facilities for training research workers and for creating new types of talent required by new approaches to education.

The establishment of these laboratories accepts the fact (at least in theory) that the process of educational research cannot be isolated and that all research will become stale and sterile unless it is extended to the classroom. We must have an educational method for the vigorous testing of proposals that grow out of research. If we hope to succeed through research, we will need school systems which will dare to experiment, to try new ideas, to *use* new means of teaching.

Finally, we must view educational research in a new way—as the basis for sound innovation, demanding new relationships among those agencies involved in educational research and practice. If we accept educational research as a process which involves all of the steps of research-program development, field testing, diffusion, and implementation, then educational agencies at all levels must be involved. All of these agencies, federal and state, local schools, colleges and universities, and industry as well, must have some appreciable degree of involvement and responsibility in each area of research.

The realization that knowledge from research is coming to play a revolutionary role in our society is now fully accepted in such sectors of the economy as defense and industry. Today, the research and development component of the Armed Services plays a major role in relation to educational policy at the state and local levels, as well as nationally. Scientific research and development can be just as effective in improving education as in the splitting of the atom. If we are to be effective, we must learn to view the school system in a different fashion, not as an impregnable fortress against change, but rather as a living, growing organism where change and experimentation are integral parts of the whole educational process. We must overcome the kind of predisposition which is exemplified in Lois Josephs' story of her experience as a college professor in an English curriculum improvement experiment in a high school. She conducted her study with considerable caution and then brought her results to the high school principal. The principal hastily looked over the findings, told her that he was pleased with the experiment—not, it turned out, because of its merit, or how it might improve his school, but because it had not disrupted his classes. His farewell to the researcher was cordial. "It's been a wonderful experience having you here," he told her. "You haven't bothered us at all."

It is our firm intent that through new programs (as the ones we are discussing today) such a story will have no counterpart in reality in the near future. We must and we will bother people.

Teacher Education in Canada

James A. MacNeill

The training of the teacher of English in Canada is, for the most part, left to the teacher himself. He is in a sense self-educated. He does receive an academic training; he does get some program in methods; but his success or failure depends on those inherent or acquired qualities which have led him into the field of English teaching. In other words, if he is not enthusiastic, imaginative, and creative before he enters the College of Arts and Science of the College of Education, he will not be any more so when he is through. If he has not developed the reading habit before entering college, he will probably never pick it up. If he does not possess the qualities of enthusiasm, imagination, creativity, sensitivity, and the habit of wide and continual reading, let us hope that he chooses another vocation. Let us hope that he is not given the power to destroy these qualities in young students. Northrop Frye makes an interesting observation in this connection in his lecture on "The Developing Imagination":

> The ultimate purpose of teaching literature is not understanding, but the transferring of the imaginative habit of mind, the instinct to create a new form instead of idolizing an old one, from the laboratory of literature to the life of mankind. Society depends heavily for its well-being on the handful of people who are imaginative in this sense. If the number became a majority, we should be living in a different world, for it would be the world that we should then have the vision and the power to construct.[1]

If it is the teacher's job when teaching literature to transfer . . . "the imaginative habit of mind," then he must have such a habit to transfer. His instructors in educational methods must exhibit the same tendency. The instructor must pass on his own zest of mind, an intensity of purpose, if he expects his student teachers to perform creditably in the classroom. The teacher of English in Canada is self-taught, unfortunately, because many of us teaching at the college level have lost that inner fire so necessary to the English teacher. What we do not have we cannot pass on. We can only hope that the young teacher will survive in spite of us. We can only hope, too, that today's youngsters will survive the clumsy efforts of our poorer products.

---

[1] Northrop Frye, "The Developing Imagination" (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), p. 58.

One writer has described the chief characteristic of teacher training institutions as stagnation. Furthermore, S.C.T. Clark, writing for the *Alberta Teachers' Association Magazine* (April 1963), describes a certain "ivory towerism" of the universities. He goes on to state that teacher training institutions have tended to lose contact with the problems and realities of the actual classroom situation.

Loss of the imaginative habit of mind and contact with the actual classroom situation are two serious indictments against those of us who teach even on a part-time basis at the college level. What has caused these losses? What are we doing about them in Canada? Loss of contact with the classroom has been a common failing among universities in general and Canadian universities in particular. Too often professors of education become woolly-minded in that they virtually forget that they are training teachers for the elementary or high school classroom. Then, too, this failing might be explained in terms of Canadian historical traditions. The British North America Act of 1867 gives the provincial legislature the exclusive right to make laws in relation to education, subject to certain limitations. Each province, therefore, has established a Department of Education which is independent of similar departments in other provinces. Each department in each province has established its own course of study and curriculum. Teachers of English go to the university where they learn theory and method. When they are hired as teachers by a local school board, they learn, through hard experience, curriculum and practice. In many instances teacher training consists of a year or two in a teachers' college following high school graduation. Salary increases at various levels of academic attainment act as stimuli to these teachers to return to the university either for a full year or for summer school sessions. The teacher wishing to move to another province must, in most instances, take extra courses to fit him for teaching in that province. Briefly then, the British North America Act is instrumental in separating the systems of education in the various provinces. Also, because the departments of education and the universities often work independently of one another, the teachers introduced into the system discover that their so-called practical training has been neglected by the universities and that they must pick up this practical side on the job.

Several programs are presently going on in Canada to achieve a closer relationship between theory and practice. J. A. Riffle, Research Assistant to the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation, in an article "Teacher Training" says this:

> If teacher training institutions provide more continuous, meaningful, on the job experiences, failures, and disappointments due to unrealistic expectations of what students are and what they can do could be minimized if not done away with entirely.[2]

A number of teacher training institutions in Canada are already practicing what Mr. Riffle suggests. Here are a few of the programs now in vogue:

1. *Traditional Program*—All students are involved in at least six weeks of practice teaching. Usually this period is divided into blocks of three two-week periods or two blocks of three-week periods.
2. *Diploma Internship Program*—This program involves students who have graduated from other colleges and who receive continuous practical experience of several weeks to a year. All work takes place in the one school.
3. *Associate Professor Plan*—This is a plan in use at Simon Fraser University in British Columbia. Groups of four students work under the guidance of a specialist cooperating teacher who will at the same time be an associate of the university.
4. *Seminar Practice Teaching Program*—Student teachers work with small groups of students in seminars. Choice of topics is left to the student teachers, but the topics must be related in some way to the field in which the student teachers are working. The student teachers are expected to stimulate discussion, create an atmosphere where good writing can take place, mark written assignments, and give constructive criticism.

In Saskatchewan we use three of the programs: the traditional program, the diploma internship program, and the seminar practice teaching program. The diploma internship program started in May 1964. Graduates of other colleges are given three complete education courses from May to August.

---

[2] J. A. Riffle, "Teacher Training," *Teacher Education and Certification, S.T.F. Regional Meetings*, 1965, p. 1.

In September, one half of the group moves to various high schools for a four-month internship; the other half continues its studies in education. In January, the first half returns to the college and the second half begins its internship. Staff members in the high school and a member of the College of Education act as supervisory personnel.

The interns handle one quarter to one third of the normal teaching load. There is, however, no fixed minimum. Usually the interns work with students of average academic ability. They assume the nonteaching duties of a regular staff member.

We see definite advantages in the diploma internship program. G. A. Sorestad, Research Assistant to the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation lists the following in an article "Internship in Teacher Education."[3]

1. The intern becomes familiar with effective classroom management.
2. He learns how material can be presented effectively.
3. He learns evaluation processes.
4. He recognizes the need for remedial instruction.
5. He learns the importance of careful planning.
6. He learns proper organization of time.
7. He is able to apply the theory he has learned in college while it is still uppermost in his mind.
8. He becomes familiar with the profession he is entering.

Apart from the advantages to the intern, there are obvious benefits to the school in which he works and to the teaching profession in general.

Some of the problems connected with the internship program are listed by Sorestad as follows:

1. There is a considerable variation in interpretation of the concept of the internship program. What should be an internship program occasionally becomes a practice teaching session.
2. As far as is known, no data are available on the effectiveness of large-scale internship programs.
3. Few universities in North America have given a full year over to an internship program.
4. The most effective internship would follow a four year training program. This poses a problem for Canadian teacher training institutions which permit teachers, with

---

[3] G. A. Sorestad: "Internship in Teacher Education," *Teacher Education and Certification, S.T.F. Regional Meetings*, 1965, p. 3.

less than four years of training, to teach. Alberta, however, has advocated an internship program for all beginning teachers.

The associate professor plan used by Simon Fraser University seems a highly effective way to give inservice training to young teachers. A. R. Mackinnon in an article, "Simon Fraser Intends to Train Teachers Differently," makes the following observations. At Simon Fraser, the young teacher first undertakes studies in Arts and Sciences, involving an examination of great writers and thinkers on scientific and literary topics. The student is tested thoroughly on this material. He must also study philosophy, psychology, anthropology, and sociology. His period of professional development is divided into two stages: an introductory period and a reading period. For the first stage of the training program, the standard entrance requirements differ for both elementary and secondary school candidates: The former group must have completed three semesters of work in Arts and Science while the latter group must have completed seven semesters.[4]

During the eight week introductory stage of their professional training, teams of four students are assigned to a high school under the supervision of a teacher designated as an Associate in Education with Simon Fraser University. This period is a critical testing time for the embryonic teacher, as he soon discovers whether he has the qualities required for the profession. The cooperative approach to planning, teaching, and evaluating provides opportunities for people to learn from each other and to aid each other in their learning.

The word *reading* in the term *reading stage* has a broad meaning. Through observational experiences and intensive study of professional literature, students undertake a detailed planning for their specific professional careers. They will then become involved in:

1. A general seminar in education which is concerned with curriculum, or
2. A specialized seminar in education which attends to curriculum methods, resources, and procedures.

This second stage of their professional development divides its time equally between school and the university. The student enrolls in Arts and Science and in Education with the intention that he will develop a unitary view of his studies as they relate to his professional role.

---

[4] A. R. Mackinnon "Simon Fraser Intends to Train Teachers Differently," *British Columbia Teacher*, May-June 1965.

The seminar approach is an experimental program started in the fall of 1965 at the University of Saskatchewan. The Dean of Education hopes to implement, probably in 1966-67, a plan whereby students in their final year would receive practical training for one whole term. As a pilot project, groups of student teachers specializing in English are allowed to come for two periods each week to one of the Saskatoon collegiates and there work under the general direction of the English staff. The student teachers work with groups consisting of eight to ten students. It has been found that such a scheme provides valuable experience for the university students and enables each of the high school students to participate in a discussion of topics related to the course. This scheme has further provided the high school students with closely supervised practice in writing, since the university student sharing responsibility for a small group is better able to exercise control and influence over the writing habits of that group than a teacher who is solely responsible for a very large number of students.

The University of Saskatchewan, in conjunction with the Saskatchewan Teachers' Federation and the Saskatchewan English Teachers' Association, is planning to establish a summer institute for teachers of English following the pattern of the NDEA English Institutes conducted in the United States. The Saskatchewan Institute has come about primarily from the sharing of ideas and enthusiasm with American profession. We in Saskatchewan are deeply grateful.

Discussion on Teacher Education

The discussion opened with a brief resume of pre- and inservice training in the three Anglo-American countries. Canada has four basic programs: (1) the normal six week practice teaching program, (2) the diploma internship program, (3) the associate professor program, and (4) the seminar practice teaching program. While very little inservice training has yet been offered in England, teacher education in the United States has been greatly enhanced by government support of education, such as through the summer institute program of the National Defense Education Act. One significant development is the gradual disappearance of teachers colleges across the United States brought about by their transformation into liberal arts colleges. Another development is the broader background in literature and linguistics being presented to elementary teachers. Andrew Wilkinson noted that, in all three countries, the profession must be basically concerned with finding a system which does not inhibit creativity in the teacher.

Although a recurrent theme of the conference held that literature is at the heart of the program, Mr. Wilkinson suggested that language is ultimately the core of the program in English. Philip Penner noted that Canada is faced with a unique problem that concerns neither the United States nor England; while England concerns itself with only English literature and the United States with both English and American literature, Canada must thoroughly cope with English, American, and French literature. This complication could be minimized by a unified program with language as the basis. Some of the participants were doubtful that language could hold the continuing interest of children, as literature can, while others were quick to point out that the emphasis on language did not mean language in isolation but language tied to reading and rhetoric. Others thought any further discussion of language unnecessary in view of the fact that the term *language* is too broad to be meaningful.

The discussion finally turned to what many considered the teacher's largest problem over the years—interest. Though pre- and inservice training must provide for the teacher an initial and continuing incentive through a complete knowledge of subject matter and methods, the participants saw teacher training playing only a limited role as a supplement to the teacher's personal interest—which is influenced significantly by his own personality, existing conditions, and his fellow teachers.

VI

The Growth and Organization, the Cooperation and Coordination of English Associations

The Organization of Teachers of English in Great Britain

Esmor Jones

As the British National Association for the Teaching of English (NATE) has been formally in existence for only just over two years, achieving a membership so far of some 3,000, it seems almost presumptuous to discuss British organization and its problems before an audience of the National Council of Teachers of English, which faced our difficulties of birth and infancy many years ago and which is now in full maturity.

However, I can hope, quite selfishly, that an account of the British situation may arouse memories of problems solved and difficulties overcome that will be of direct help to us on our return home.

The English educational system is of a confusing complexity. When members of NCTE visited England on a study tour this summer, I remember their surprise on being taken round Winchester College—certainly one of the most impressive and most ancient of our independent fee-paying schools which we so quaintly term "public." In contradistinction to this, we are apt to describe the schools supported by public money from national taxes and local rates as "state" schools. As a consequence, I have met a number of Americans who deduce from this that our system is similar to that found in some European countries—that is, centrally controlled and organized.

There is indeed a national Ministry of Education, now (confusingly) called the Department of Education and Science. The Secretary of State is an important member of the British Cabinet. This government Department is a spending department above all else, and its chief power stems from this—its ability to exert control over the *general* educational pattern of the country by its allocation of limited national resources. The second principal function of the Department is *advisory*. The British "state system" so-called, is, in fact, a local system. The running of our schools is in the hands of the local city and county councils, and here the British and American systems are much closer to each other than is always appreciated.

It is almost true to say that there are as many forms of educational organization in Great Britain as there are local education authorities. While Act of Parliament or government policy may lay down very broad general principles (witness the recent circular of our Department of Education and Science requesting education authorities to prepare schemes in their areas for a "comprehensive" system of secondary education), the local authority has considerable freedom to apply or modify the policy as seems best suited to local needs and local opinion.

Furthermore, and here we differ from at any rate, the practice of some American school boards, whatever organizational pattern the local authority may devise for its area, the school itself retains a remarkable degree of freedom to manage its own affairs. It would seem that the pattern of grants moving down from the center through local councils to the schools might have led to central control of the *content* of education. But we do not even have local council control of content. By and large, every single school in Great Britain is a law to itself. Indeed, so is every teacher. There are local authorities which have attempted to have a say in what is taught in their schools; there are head teachers who direct the work of their assistant staff in detail. But the rarity of such attempts virtually makes them newsworthy. The norm is the responsibility of the individual teacher for what he or she teaches in the classroom.

Let me illustrate briefly from my own situation. I teach in a moderate sized secondary school with some 750 pupils. I am Head of the English Department. As such, I, not the Headmaster, am responsible for the English syllabus of the school; I decide how the money available annually for the department is spent; I decide what books are to be bought for classroom use. But I cannot dictate how, in terms of the syllabus, my colleagues should teach. It is reasonable for me to insist that the school English syllabus be followed; it would not be thought reasonable for me to dictate the organization of work lesson by lesson. I can only advise. From his standpoint the Headmaster advises me. Also available is a structure of external advice, as many local authorities assign advisory staff to visit the schools and give guidance on curricular matters.

We also have the system of a national Inspectorate. Her

Majesty's Inspectors, it is true, are responsible for the maintenance of standards, but they have no executive powers over the schools. They can recommend and they can advise; they cannot compel a school to follow any particular curricular pattern. I would not exchange this almost anarchical freedom for anything in the world. But it does make the teacher in any subject a peculiarly lonely figure. This very independence makes the teacher in Britain more difficult to help than, I suspect, a teacher almost anywhere else. There is comparatively little tradition of consultation save on those matters which, perforce, bring teachers together—salaries and general conditions of service. The result has been that the growth of general associations of teachers, more analogous perhaps to trade unions, has been marked this century, though even here there is no unity. The growth of associations devoted to the curriculum has been slow, for a high proportion of educational discussion is intensely parochial—within the individual school itself, in fact. Very few of us know what happens in the classrooms of neighboring schools. Very few of us in secondary schools know what happens in the primary schools which annually send us pupils. So independence has been bought at the expense of "apartness."

Many of us think that this cost has been unnecessary and have tried, over the years, in the context of the freedom I have described, to help teachers of English to discuss common problems and share experiences.

Curiously, however, the first attempts to provide such opportunities for English teachers came virtually from outside the ranks of school teachers. I should perhaps mention in passing that the general associations have subject subcommittees, but these tend to be remote and to make little impact; and were it not for their traditional association with examining bodies and with advisory committees of the Department of Education and Science, they would long ago have ceased to exist. The emergence of subject associations such as NATE is removing their raison d'être, though it may take some time for this to be understood.

As early as 1906 the English Association was formed, but it has never been specifically concerned with the teaching of English. The English Association is, in fact, a body of people who are interested in English as a language and as a literature and thus includes a very wide range of professional users of the language—writers, artists, actors, administrators, lawyers, and members of the general public as well as teachers. The result has been that the work of the Association for schools has been peripheral and in effect limited to the grammar school. There have been some useful publications over the years (though not very recently), but the main role of the Association has been in the survey of university work in English for its heterogeneous membership and in the provision of meetings, in London and one or two places, at which books can be discussed.

Not until the postwar reorganization of our educational system, however, was the need felt for an organization more specifically professional. The new secondary modern schools developed academic ambitions and shifted from the class teacher to the subject specialist. The General Certificate of Education, ministry recognized but university organized, was seen as the passport to a tremendous variety of skilled employment and spread from the grammar schools into the supposedly nonacademic secondary modern schools. The primary school became geared to the business of preparing pupils, not to go into the world on reaching the great age of fourteen but to find a place in the secondary hierarchy at eleven. And so the external pressures and demands have risen outside the door of the classroom.

The first postwar attempt to meet the growing need for professional guidance was largely local—with one important exception: the growth of the quarterly periodical, *The Use of English,* from its inception under the editorship of Denys Thompson. However, one might assess the attitude of teachers to the general philosophy of English teaching that informs the work of this journal, it remained for many years the *only* journal devoted to the practical business of teaching English in the classroom. Its readership has been in the past largely secondary, however, and this has been to some extent a limitation upon its coverage. Recently there have been considerable efforts to develop a much larger primary school readership.

Locally, teachers of English began to come together. In several cities loose associations of teachers of English came into existence. A few were technically branches of the English Association; the majority were quite independent. Strongest of these, perhaps, was the London Association for the Teaching of English which has held some valuable conferences, sponsored some equally valuable books for school use, and prepared some equally valuable study papers. The Association is, however, predominantly secondary in orientation, and its insistence on being a *working* body has kept it comparatively small in numbers.

In the last ten years, the quarterly, *The Use of English,* has encouraged the emergence of local discussion groups and tribute must be paid to its disinterested work in this field. Some twenty Use of English Groups are indeed in existence in Britain today, but they tend to be small and loosely organized, attracting those teachers most in sympathy with the broad approach of the journal from which they take their name. I am conscious that these are rather dangerous generalizations—some Use of English Groups are large and highly organized, and readership of the journal is far from being a condition of membership.

It is in this context that the National Association for the Teaching of English was born in September 1963. In organization we are virtually a federation of local associations. The local associations and Use of English Groups which joined together to found NATE wrote into our constitution specific provisions to protect the local autonomy of their groups. We have thus side by side a fairly conventional Branch structure and a system of Corporate membership. This may prove to be a transitional phase as already a number of Use of English Groups have decided that they would be better operating as Branches of the Association.

Because the roots of the Association are local, we have to work in a tradition of local activity and of distrust of central authority. The principal tension in our life is that between the urgency of so much of the work and the consequent temptation to get it done quickly through central committees, and the instinct of the local group for the parochial. One sometimes senses the attitude: let NATE produce the books and pamphlets (for a very low subscription) while we go our own sweet local way!

The solution, as we see it so far, is to involve the local branch in the national work. For example, we are engaged in the production at the moment of a survey of the English examinations of the General Certificate of Education. Most of the preliminary work of studying the various papers of this examination has been done by subcommittees of our local branches. Though this is the pattern we should most like to follow, it is not always the most efficient way to work if one is in a hurry. For example, we share one problem with our American friends. It is much easier to interest the specialist English teacher in a "subject" association than it is to interest the teacher who spends only a part of his time teaching English. We encounter immense difficulties in persuading the primary school teacher to join. As yet, few local branches have enough primary school members to undertake much work at branch level. Inevitably, therefore, the burden falls centrally and will continue to do so until the achievement arouses the interest. In all organizations such as ours with ambitions to be wholly comprehensive, this particular problem and also the problem of the "break-through" point exist. At present, with the burden upon honorary officers great and growing, there is a clear limit to what can be achieved with purely voluntary resources. At what point will the equation solve itself? We need full-time staff to expand our membership properly; we need a large membership to pay a full-time staff. Inevitably, we have to spend much time with financial and organizational problems when really, as teachers of English, we should be best deploying our energies in guarding through our teaching the linguistic and literary inheritance of English as a live and growing tradition in our complex society.

Such is a brief account of our situation and of the early growth of NATE. I think the achievement in two years, some of the evidence of which is on display at this convention, is one of which we need not be ashamed. Indeed, we are running into the danger of being accepted, almost prematurely, as the professional voice of English teachers, before we have the size and the organization to cope with the tasks such recognition brings.

But to my mind, the root of the problem and the challenge is the isolation of the teacher. Far too often do we regard ourselves as separate creatures—as university lecturers in English, as infant school teachers, as secondary school teachers—and the habits of apartness encouraged by the organization of education prevent us from recognizing our common concerns as teachers and as teachers of English. To be truly successful, NATE must find all these teachers working together as colleagues on common experiences and problems. We must be a society in which the university lecturer not only gives but learns, in which the classroom teacher not only receives but gives. This is the context of organization and of work.

Professional English Associations in Canada

Merron Chorny

A consideration of the professional English organizations in the United States, Great Britain, and Canada permits an examination of national associations of English teachers at three stages of development. In the United States, the National Council of Teachers of English gives leadership and service based on more than a half century of growth and experience. In Great Britain, the National Association for the Teaching of English has overcome the problems of initial organization and faces the challenges of extending its leadership and its services. In Canada, the problems of initial organization are still to be resolved; as yet, there is no national association of teachers of English.

In part, an explanation for the lack of a national professional English organization may be found by examining the educational system in Canada. Such an examination provides insight, as well, into the professional English organizations which have evolved.

By constitution, education in Canada is a provincial responsibility. Each of the ten provinces maintains its own educational system under the direction of a Department of Education. The Department exercises financial control by allocating provincial grants for education. The influence of the province extends beyond the financial, however. Each Department of Education, with limited exceptions, also determines the content of education: it sets the courses of study for the province; it authorizes the textbooks for the courses; it conducts, at certain grade levels, external examinations based on the courses of study. Although the immediate control of the public schools is subject to local authorities, they must operate within the context of the provincial control.

Within this structure, the teacher in Canada has been limited, essentially, in determining what is taught. How he teaches is, theoretically, an individual matter. However, statements of content, authorized textbooks, and external examinations have tended to inhibit freedom of teaching practice as well.

The type of control exercised by each province over education must be considered as an influence on both the nature and the direction of the development of professional English organizations in Canada, a development which presents interesting contrasts to the developments in Great Britain and the United States. Whereas, in Great Britain the independence of the teacher may have posed difficulties for the formation of a national English association, in Canada the circumscription of teacher freedom may have been a factor in the belated formation of professional English organizations. Despite the fact that, in both the United States and Canada, principal jurisdiction over education rests with agencies other than the federal, the need for a national English association was recognized, in one country, and an association was formed over fifty years ago; in the other country, a national association is only now being seriously proposed. To attempt to explain these contrasts and the development of professional English organizations in Canada solely in terms of the provincial systems of education would be to overstate the case.

The influence of the form of the provincial educational systems, however, cannot be discounted. Under extensive central control of education, the need for professional improvement may appear to be adequately satisfied by conferences and workshops organized by central and local authorities; the reasons for a professional English organization may not be apparent. Further, even when the need for a professional organization is recognized, it will be designed to serve the area over which the central authority has control. These two generalizations describe the professional English organizations in Canada.

First, these organizations are comparatively recent; of the five now organized, four have been established since 1960. A sixth one will be formed before the end of this year. Second, all six organizations, existing and proposed, are provincial, established to serve the English teachers within a particular province. In structure and organization, each provincial English association has many characteristics of the National Council of Teachers of English. However, it seems probable that when a national association is formed in Canada, the organization will be similar to that of the National Association for the Teaching of English; it will be a federation embracing existing groups, recognizing certain rights of these groups.

The origins of professional English organizations in Canada can be traced to two principal sources: professional English organizations in the United States and professional associations of teachers in Canada. For many years Canadian teachers have held membership in the National Council of Teachers of English and in the International Reading Association, as well as subscribed in their publications. At the present time approximately 2,000 Canadian teachers are associated with each of these two organizations. Canadian affiliates of the International Reading Association are active in a number of provinces. The affiliates are organizations additional to the provincial professional associations referred to earlier. Of the provincial organizations, two are now affiliates of the National Council of Teachers of English.

Professional teachers' associations, as well, are an influence. The Ontario Educational Association, a general association of educationists, has an English Section of over 400 teachers which holds an annual convention, publishes a magazine, and engages in other professional activities. The New Brunswick Teachers' Association has provided leadership in the establishment of a provincial English Council.

Perhaps the most interesting development in professional English organizations in Canada is taking place now in the four western provinces where teacher associations are leading the establishment of subject area councils. In each of the four western provinces, all the teachers are represented by a single teachers' association. Membership in each association is automatic. These associations have been in the forefront in economics and teacher welfare. About ten years ago they turned to the area of professional development; out of their deliberations grew the subject area councils.

Here was the genesis of the professional English organizations in the four western provinces. In 1960, both the Secondary Association of Teachers of English of British Columbia and the English Council of Alberta were organized. The Saskatchewan English Teachers' Association was formed in 1963. An English association will be formed in Manitoba before the end of this year.

In the three professional English organizations which have been formed, in British Columbia, Alberta, and Saskatchewan, a similar pattern is evident. Each organization receives, from the sponsoring body, financial support ranging from an annual grant of $300 in Saskatchewan, to one which may exceed $1,000 in Alberta. Additional grants may be made for special projects.

Each of the three organizations has established publications and has instituted an annual conference. Each is organizing regional affiliates and is developing inservice education programs for teachers of English. Alberta and British Columbia have affiliated with the National Council of Teachers of English; probably Saskatchewan will apply for affiliation. An informal liaison has been established among these three provincial organizations.

Although most of the professional English organizations in Canada have been formed within the past five years, they have already made noteworthy advances and overcome numerous difficulties. They still face many problems, problems which they share with the National Association for the Teaching of English. Membership is small: British Columbia has 700 members; Alberta and Ontario, 400 each; Saskatchewan, 100. The organizations need to extend their base of leadership. They need to undertake services formerly provided by other agencies in the province. In order to grow, they need to establish active and committed regional affiliates. However, the organizational work involved makes extreme demands upon the limited number of key personnel in each central organization. These problems, and others, are being met and, I am convinced, will be resolved.

One major issue, which has been resolved in Great Britain and in the United States, we still face: the formation of a national professional English organization in Canada. Although we are fortunate in having the experiences of the National Association for the Teaching of English and of the National Council of Teachers of English to guide us, some of our problems are unique, and new solutions will need to be found for them.

In 1964, the National Council of Teachers of English sponsored, at its annual convention at Cleveland, the first conference for Canadian Teachers of English. The conference, devoted entirely to the question of the formation of a national organization, elected a committee of representatives from various provinces to investigate the question further. This year, at the second conference for Canadian teachers of English, again sponsored by the National Council, the report of the committee will be presented and discussed. While I am unable to state what decisions will be made at this conference, I am certain that they will represent a major step toward the formation of a national professional English organization in Canada.

Professional English Associations in the United States

Ralph C. Staiger

In the United States, professional English associations appear to exist for the same reason as thousands of other groups—to provide a meeting place for individuals of similar interests, a forum for the exchange of ideas and, sometimes, a marketplace for personnel. Services to members grow from the association's purposes and take various forms, depending upon the vitality, size, and interests of the group.

Since they are voluntary organizations and no requirement to join normally exists, the influence of the members is significant. Depending upon the degree of his participation, a member is likely to be cognizant of new ideas in his sphere of interest and is often an influencer of opinion in his home community if, indeed, he is not an innovator of professional improvement.

English is a blanket term which, in our schools and colleges, has come to include the study of many aspects of language, and individuals have developed foci of interest in the various areas and at different levels. When an interest becomes important to a number of persons, a new organization is sometimes created. Often these begin within an ongoing organization and become an administrative subdivision of the parent group. Sometimes a completely new unit is formed. Often ongoing organizations merge because their interests are similar.

One focus of interest is the educational level at which members work—college or university, high school or elementary school teaching. Although most groups acknowledge the arbitrariness of these divisions and are concerned about articulation between levels, the differences still exist.

The Modern Language Association attracts college and university teachers of English and modern foreign languages for the purpose advancing all aspects of literary and linguistic study.

It studies foreign language teaching promotes a cooperative English program emphasizing the sequential nature of the teaching of literature and writing at all levels.

The Commission on English of the College Entrance Examination Board also seeks articulation between the high school and college. It analyzes and proposes standards for student and teacher working conditions, teacher training and retraining, and curriculum content for secondary schools, to determine what the colleges consider as competence in English, and to suggest how differences can be reduced to agreement. The college teacher's influence is quite evident in the activities of both these professional groups.

Other college-oriented groups are the College English Association, comprised of faculties of English and related disciplines in colleges and universities in the United States, and the English Institute, a much smaller regional organization of college teachers.

The National Council of Teachers of English, I need not emphasize, is a large association which was initially high school-oriented and still continues to draw much of its membership from secondary schools. More than thirty years ago, however, it published a college edition of the *English Journal*, which became *College English*, and in 1942 purchased the Elementary *English Review*, now called *Elementary English*, which extended the Elementary Section's influence over a larger proportion of elementary school teachers.

The National Council is broadly based in its levels and interests. A perusal of an NCTE convention program indicates the richness of its offerings and reflects the concerns of its members. As do some of the other organizations, it has number of local and state councils affiliated with the parent organization and student groups related to parent local affiliates. These groups can exert local influence which leads to the improvement of teaching practices.

Nevertheless, separate special interest groups have evolved. An example is the National Conference on Research in English, a very small group of persons with research interests. In all probability its members without exception belong to the National Council, which issues the Conference's reports. Nevertheless, a high degree of independence in policy making exists.

Other groups concerned with aspects of English language teaching have developed, such as the Speech Association of America, the American Forensic Association, the National Association of Speech and the Dramatic Arts. More tangentially, we have the American Speech Correction Association and the American Speech and Hearing Association. Two groups with an entirely different purpose are the Simpler Spelling Association and the Spelling Reform Association. Their fringe relationship should exclude them from the paper, but English teachers should be aware of their existence

Discussion on the Problems and Possibilities of International Cooperation

Social Values and Curriculum Development

In the final discussion at the conference, the participants approached such issues as the role of the English program in society, the image of the teacher, and the concept of English in an integrated curriculum. George Allen felt that the English program has generally a broad, twofold purpose—preparing *everyone* for life in our automated state and at the same time achieving quality of education for the advanced. Frank Whitehead questioned the extent to which teachers examine the values which they are teaching. This concern for social values beyond education is present in all countries. Some participants were distressed with the image of the teacher as priest. In view of the fact that teachers come to literature with personal, precomposed values, this image can lead to a situation where the teacher is finding new, imperative values instead of enabling the students to find their own. Muriel Crosby noted that with the celebrated launching of the Russian sputnik, a major movement was started to reform American education, one aspect of which was to departmentalize even the elementary curriculum. The elementary people feared that this departmentalization too often results in greater attention to subjects other than English literature, especially in the minds of unqualified teachers who do not recognize its significance. Elementary teachers often consider themselves to be teachers of reading, not of English.

Reading Interests

A major concern of group participants was the lack of interest of all ages in reading. The group speculated as to what English educators might do to encourage more reading. Paul Diederich reported that the amount of reading increases through grade eight (age thirteen), then decreases throughout life. Among the reasons advanced for this decline was the greater emphasis attached to sports, homework, and such home diversions as television; and to school activities, to nonreading home environments, to belles lettres (which have lately developed in the United States), and to textbooks and readers which kill interest. John H. Fisher suggested the possibility of a "hereditary" reason for the lack of reading interest in the United States: many American ancestors were definitely not book readers. However, Joseph Mersand quickly pointed out that many immigrants brought with them to this country the Bible, Bunyan, Shakespeare, and other works.

Considerable discussion ensued about what can be done to encourage more reading. Denys Thompson suggested that abridgements of *Johnny Tremain* or *The Prince and the Pauper* might be useful in closing the gap between juvenile and adult books. He mentioned the fact that with some books, such as *Moby Dick* and *Pride and Prejudice,* condensations are possible. Several participants saw no possible justification for abridging; others distinguished between slight abridgements and complete rewriting. Randolph Quirk noted that *Hamlet* is cut by at least one third whenever it is performed. Mr. Mersand expressed concern for the lowest 25 to 30 percent of students who would never benefit from literature were it not for abridgements. The general conclusion was that some editing of standard works may help the teacher, but such editing must not be mistaken for rewriting which is not even literature. Additional suggestions were advanced for paperback libraries, summer reading programs, more complete libraries in schools, more literary study in the elementary schools, more general class discussion and argument about novels and poetry, and development of a program of suitable classics for each age level, including an earlier introduction to drama and poetry. Many of the participants seemed to favor what Lewis Leary termed "benevolent censorship," or as Mr. Whitehead said, "suitability prediction," which the teacher might exercise with the *individual* needs and abilities of his students in mind. A program would then follow the student's natural development and maturity with a transition from the simplified world to the complex world by means of more mature, complex literature.

Language and School Programs

Randolph Quirk observed that both papers and discussion at the conference had ventilated such issues as the persistent belief that within scientific linguistics and practical applications of language exists an artifact known as "good English." Mr. Quirk felt that much of the trouble in the native-English teaching situation now springs from this definition. Too often a child is taught a language which is at variance with his experience. English in the classroom should not be so rigid as to overlook these variations. The next important issue raised by Mr. Quirk's statement was the "rudderless feeling" now prevailing among English teachers in regard to language as a subject. But this is not by any means confined to the English-speaking world. In all "advanced countries," the native language is taught, but the theoretical basis for such teaching is shaky, and there is little agreement on what it achieves or even on what it sets out to achieve.

Frederic Cassidy noted that, unlike particular works of literature, language involves change; it has no single standard; it is not monolithic but is full of shades and nuances. English educators must enlighten people as to the complexity of good English. In placing this in the curriculum, teachers should remember that language is *not* something separate from literature but is in fact one of the chief concerns of literary scholars. In order to study language scientifically, a person must first study linguistics. After considering such complex but imperative questions as "How do you put language in the curriculum?"—"What level of language should we work for?"—and "How must we tie up language learning with social phenomena?" the participants generally agreed that everyone needs to be taught what language is, and he needs to be taught well.

Future Cooperation

Participants unanimously favored formation of a continuing International Conference to be sponsored by teachers in the three countries and held in alternate years on each side of the ocean. James Squire hoped that NCTE might be able to sponsor such a program with the help of Canadian teachers during the summer of 1967 or 1968. George Allen suggested that the scope of the meeting might at first be limited to 100 or 200 participants. One major problem in organizing a continuing conference is that NATE, which is only two years old, and the Canadian groups, which have not as yet formed a national Canadian organization, may not be strong enough for some time to support conferences in their own countries.

Enthusiasm was extremely high for the ultimate values to be gained by teachers from tours of foreign countries such as Esmor Jones was planning through the United States. Participants urged that such exchange of ideas "in the field" might continue.

The group agreed that an annotated bibliography of books on the teaching of English from the three countries should be most valuable. J. N. Hook agreed to prepare (with the help of Mr. Mersand) a list of references for the United States; Frank Whitehead will prepare one for Great Britain; and Philip Penner, one for Canada.

Lastly, the participants applauded the willingness of the NATE leaders to prepare a column for *Elementary English* and the *English Journal* on latest developments in the various countries, should NCTE so request. Such columns might ultimately be a continuing feature of journals in all three countries.

VII

Selected References

References on the Teaching of English in the United States

Compiled by J. N. Hook, University of Illinois

The following highly selective bibliography is restricted to fifty items, published for the most part since 1960, dealing specifically with the teaching of English. No attempt has been made to include any of the large number of significant, seminal research studies in language, composition, literature, and curriculum that have contributed heavily to curricular change in the past few years; these would warrant a separate and no less extensve bibliography.

The compiler wishes to express his thanks for the assistance of Professors William H. Evans and Paul Jacobs, University of Illinois; Dr. Joseph Mersand, Jamaica High School, New York; and Professor Miriam Wilt, Temple University.

Cross-Level

Botel, Morton. *How to Teach Reading.* Chicago: Follett Publishing Co., 1962.

Practical suggestions for grades 1-12.

Braddock, Richard, *et al. Research in Written Composition.* Champaign, Ill.: National Council of Teachers of English, 1963.

Summarizes the little we really *know* about teaching composition.

Commission on English. *Freedom and Discipline in English.* New York: College Entrance Examination Board, 1965.

A fascinating amalgam of educational philosophy and practical recommendations; has been reviewed with both hostility and enthusiasm.

Conference on English Education. Annual Report (title varies). Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1963—present.

Talks and summaries from annual conferences of persons responsible for preparing and supervising English teachers.

Evans, William H., ed. "Testing in English," *Illinois English Bulletin,* Feb. 1965. Urbana, Ill.: Illinois Association of Teachers of English, 1965.
Six articles on preparation of tests.

Golden, Ruth I. *Improving Patterns of English Usage.* Detroit: Wayne State University Press, 1960.
Report by a teacher in predominantly Negro schools.

Hogan, Robert F., ed. *The English Language in the School Program.* Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1966. In press.
Proceedings of Spring 1963 and 1964 NCTE institutes on linguistics.

Jewett, Arno, *et al. Improving English Skills of Culturally Different Youth.* USOE Bulletin 1964, No. 5. Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1964.
Papers presented at an Office of Education conference.

NCTE Commission on the English Curriculum. *The Education of Teachers of English for American Schools and Colleges.* Vol. V, NCTE Curriculum Series. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1963.
The major work on this subject.

——. *The English Language Arts,* Vol. I, NCTE Curriculum Series. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.
Bases for planning a curriculum, K-12.

NCTE Committee on the National Interest. *The National Interest and the Continuing Education of Teachers of English.* Champaign, Ill.: NCTE 1964.
Recommendations on continuing study for elementary and secondary teachers.

——. *The National Interest and the Teaching of English.* Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1961.
Statistical analysis, with recommendations that have influenced national policies in support of English instruction.

NCTE Task Force on Teaching English to the Disadvantaged. *Language Programs for the Disadvantaged.* Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1965.
Observations of existing programs, with many specific recommendations.

Pooley, Robert C. *Teaching English Grammar.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1957.
Historically based treatment with recommendations for teaching; excellent, but needs updating.

——. *Teaching English Usage.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1946.
Influential and still valuable study, now being revised.

Reid, Loren. *Teaching Speech,* Third Ed. Columbia, Mo.: Artcraft Press, 1960.

Methods book covering in-class and out-of-class speech activities.

Steinberg, Erwin R., ed. *Needed Research in the Teaching of English.* Washington, D. C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1963.

Proceedings of a seminal conference.

Stone, George W., ed. *Issues, Problems, and Approaches in the Teaching of English.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, Inc., 1961.

A collection of provocative and informative articles, including the influential definition of 35 basic issues. (Statement of Basic Issues is also available separately from NCTE and MLA.)

Walter, Nina W. *Let Them Write Poetry.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1962.

Motivation and techniques, grades 1-12; contains numerous poems by children.

Elementary

Anderson, Paul I. *Language Skills in Elementary Education.* New York: The Macmillan Co., 1964.

Comprehensive methods book, stressing specifics.

Applegate, Mauree. *Easy in English.* Evanston, Ill.: Harper & Row, 1960.

Imaginative, lively book on elementary methods, with "Cupboards of Ideas" and samples of children's writing.

Arnstein, Flora J. *Poetry in the Elementary Classroom.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1962.

Increasing children's enjoyment of poetry.

Burrows, Alvina, *et al. They All Want to Write: Written English in the Elementary School,* Third Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1964.

Techniques of teaching composition.

Dawson, Mildred, and Marian Zollinger. *Guiding Language Learning,* Second Ed. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1963.

Methods book, organized by grade level.

Elementary English. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1924—present.

Ed. William A. Jenkins. Monthly journal summarizing research findings and offering specific classroom helps.

Gans, Roma. *Common Sense in Teaching Reading.* Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Co., 1963.

Appropriately titled.

Glaus, Marlene. *From Thoughts to Words.* Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1965.

"A book of enrichment activities written for elementary teachers to use with children."

Hildreth, Gertrude. *Teaching Spelling*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1955.

The best known book on this subject.

Lefevre, Carl. *Linguistics and the Teaching of Reading*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.

Along with C. C. Fries' *Linguistics and Reading* (Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1963), makes the first in-depth explorations of a significant new field.

NCTE Commission on the English Curriculum. *Language Arts for Today's Children*. Vol. II, NCTE Curriculum Series. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1954.

Curriculum planning and evaluation in listening, speaking, reading, and writing, for early childhood, middle grades, and upper grades.

Russell, David H. *Children Learn to Read,* Second Ed. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1961.

Comprehensive, scholarly treatment of reading from preschool through junior high.

Smith, Nila B. *Reading Instruction for Today's Children.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1963.

Research-based, specific, candid.

Squire, James R., *et al. Source Book on English Institutes for Elementary Teachers.* Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1965.

Cosponsored by MLA; describes most needed work in English and curriculum for elementary teachers who attend institutes or otherwise pursue further education.

Strickland, Ruth G. *The Language Arts in the Elementary School,* Second Ed. Boston: D. C. Heath & Co., 1957.

Stress on interrelations of linguistic and personal development in the child; of special value to experienced teachers.

Wolfe, Don M. *Language Arts and Life Patterns, Grade 2 through 8.* New York: The Odyssey Press, Inc., 1961.

Emphasis on children's self-expression.

Secondary and College

Burton, Dwight L. *Literature Study in the High School,* Second Ed. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1964.

Comprehensive, practical treatment.

Burton, Dwight L., and John Simmons, eds. *Teaching English in Today's High Schools.* New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, Inc., 1965.

Balanced collection of essays, mainly from the *English Journal* and *College English.*

College Composition and Communication. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1950–present.

Ed. William F. Irmscher. Quarterly journal with stress on college freshman English.

College English. Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1938–present.

Ed. Richard Ohmann. Monthly journal on literary interpretation, linguistics, teaching procedures, etc.

English Journal, Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1912–present.

Ed. Richard S. Alm. Monthly journal for the secondary school teacher of English; annotated index available for 1944-63.

Fowler, Mary Elizabeth. *Teaching Language, Composition, and Literature.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965.

Carefully organized, practical methods book.

Gordon, Edward J., and Edward I. Noyes, eds. *Essays on the Teaching of English.* New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1960.

Papers from Yale conferences.

Guth, Hans P. *English Today and Tomorrow.* Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1964.

Penetrating analysis of kinds of content to be stressed.

Hook, J. N. *The Teaching of High School English,* Third Ed. New York: The Ronald Press Co., 1965.

"Idea Boxes" supplement chapters of discussion.

Kitzhaber, Albert R. *Themes, Theories, and Therapy: The Teaching of Writing in College.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1963.

Problems and recommendations, with special attention to the Dartmouth College program.

Loban, Walter, *et al. Teaching Language and Literature.* New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, Inc., 1961.

Almost encyclopedic treatment of curriculum and teaching procedures.

NCTE Commission on the English Curriculum. *A Check List for Evaluating the English Program in the Junior and Senior High School.* Champaign, Ill.: NCTE, 1962.

Reprinted from the April 1962 *English Journal.*

——. *The College Teaching of English.* Vol. IV, NCTE Curriculum Series, ed. by John C. Gerber, Curt A. Zimansky, and John H. Fisher. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1965.

Chapters by various hands; prepared in collaboration with Modern Language Association, American Studies Association, and College English Association.

——. *The English Language Arts in the Secondary School.* Vol. III, NCTE Curriculum Series. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1956.

Emphasis on principles of curriculum building.

NCTE Committee on English Programs for Students of Superior Ability. *English for the Academically Talented Student in the Secondary School.* Washington, D. C.: National Education Ass'n, 1960.

Rationale and desirable procedures.

References on the Teaching of English in Great Britain

Compiled by Frank Whitehead, University of Sheffield

General Principles of English Teaching

Ford, Boris, ed. *Young Writers, Young Readers.* London: Hutchinson & Co., 1960-1963.

Articles on children's reading and children's writing reprinted (mainly) from the *Journal of Education;* together with a 50-page anthology of children's writing, and a booklist of fiction recommended for children.

Gurrey, P. *Teaching the Mother Tongue in Secondary Schools.* London: Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., 1958.

A clear and valuable exposition of the main issues, coupled with a number of helpful practical suggestions. Intended particularly for the student-in-training or the beginning teacher.

Holbrook, David. *English for Maturity.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1961.

An eloquent uneven book; powerful in its propagandist plea for the centrality of literature in English teaching; sometimes muddled in its arguments; often very much at sea in its detailed practical suggestions.

Hourd, Marjorie L. *The Education of the Poetic Spirit.* London: Heinemann Group of Publishers Ltd., 1949.

An interesting study of the creativity shown by children in their dramatizations and their poetry writing. Often questionable in its details, and sometimes naive in its psychologizing; but valuable because it raises important issues.

Jackson, Brian, ed. *English versus Examinations.* London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1965.

A second selection of articles reprinted from *The Use of English;* contains some valuable descriptive accounts of good classroom practice, in both primary and secondary schools.

Jackson, Brian, and Denys Thompson, eds. *English in Education.* London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1962.

A collection of articles reprinted from the quarterly magazine

The Use of English. By no means the best selection that could have been made, but able, even so, to open up promising lines of thought.

Summerfield, Geoffrey. *Topics in English.* London: Batsford Ltd., 1965.

A discussion of the content of English lessons in the secondary school with special reference to the role of the "project"; followed by detailed practical suggestions about thirty topics that can be used for such work.

Walsh, J. H. *Teaching English to Children of Eleven to Sixteen—An Account of Day-to-Day Practice.* London: Heinemann Group of Publishers Ltd., 1965.

Generous in its provision of practical suggestions and advice; oriented particularly towards the more able pupil. Generally shrewd and sensitive; rather conservative in some respects, e.g., in attitude to drama, and in docile acceptance of the requirements of external examinations.

Whitehead, Frank. *The Disappearing Dais: A Study of the Principles and Practice of English Teaching.* London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1966.

Background Reading

A. Literary Criticism

Eliot, T. S. *Selected Essays.* London: Faber & Faber Ltd., 1951.

Still of central importance, even though many of the best essays were published in the early twenties.

Harding, D. W. *Experience into Words.* London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1963.

Essays, mainly studies of individual poets, in which the insight of the literary critic and the psychologist combine to explore the relationship between literary and nonliterary experience.

Leavis, F. R. *Education and the University.* London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1943.

A persuasive argument for the centrality of literary studies in liberal education, together with extended exposition and exemplification of what is meant by "the literary-critical discipline."

Richards, I. A. *Practical Criticism.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1929.

A documented exposition of the difficulties experienced by highly educated adult readers in understanding, responding to, and judging poems the authorship of which had not been disclosed. Even today an indispensable source book for the teacher of English.

B. Cultural Studies

Hall, Stuart, and Paddy Whannel. *The Popular Arts.* London: Hutchinson & Co., 1964.

A discussion of the issues raised for education by the popular arts—cinema, T.V., pop music, magazine fiction, the press. General thesis: that the best pop art is good in its own way, and the teacher should aim not at weaning the pupil away from it but at helping him discriminate within it. Overextended, questionable in many of its judgments, but useful in its challenge to many customary assumptions.

Hoggart, Richard. *The Uses of Literacy.* London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1958; also Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books Ltd., 1965.

Contrasts the values embodied in the working class culture of the writer's childhood with those of today's commercialized mass-culture. The conceptual framework is shaky, but valuable insights are generated by the way.

Leavis, F. R., and Denys Thompson. *Culture and Environment.* London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1933.

Though much of the illustrative material is dated, this remains an invaluable mine of suggestions for the English teacher in his dealings with newspapers, magazines, advertising, popular fiction, etc.

Thompson, Denys, ed. *Discrimination and Popular Culture.* Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin Books, Ltd., 1965.

A symposium on advertising, the press, films, television, pop music, and industrial design. Uneven, but does make a serious attempt to bring the ideas of *Culture and Environment* into relationship with the contemporary cultural scene.

Williams, Raymond. *Culture and Society.* London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1958.

A study of the intellectual climate from the end of the eighteenth century to the present day, with special reference to the changing use of the term "culture." Stimulating, but difficult.

——. *The Long Revolution.* Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1961.

Complementary to *Culture and Society.* Social and cultural change in Britain over the past few centuries, in the light of the author's concept of culture as "a whole way of life."

C. Language and Child Development

Lewis, M. M. *Language, Thought and Personality in Infancy and Childhood.* London: G. G. Harrap Ltd., 1963.

Attempts to draw together into a coherent pattern what is known, to date, about the development of language in young children.

D. Language and Linguistics

Firth, J. R. *The Tongues of Men and Speech.* London: Oxford University Press, 1964.

For three decades Professor Firth was the leading figure in the British tradition of linguistic science, a tradition which developed its own characteristics, significantly different, in many ways, from those of American structuralism. This volume reprints two works of popularization intended for the general public, which Firth published in the 1930's. Trenchant and highly readable (if a little scrappy in shape), they provide an excellent introduction to his general point of view on language.

Halliday, M. A. K., Augus McIntosh, and Peter D. Strevens. *The Linguistic Sciences and Language Teaching.* London: Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., 1964.

A thorough but concise exposition, from a neo-Firthian standpoint, of the nature of modern linguistic science, followed by sensible and helpful discussions of the part linguistics can play both in the teaching of the mother-tongue and in the teaching of a second language.

Quirk, Randolph. *The Use of English.* London: Longmans, Green & Co., Ltd., 1962.

An admirably lively discussion of the main issues which arise in the study of the English language today. Covers a wide field; eclectic in general approach; the argument illustrated (and made accessible to the general reader) by a wealth of fascinating examples. Contains two useful appendices, one on the transmission system of English by A. C. Gimson, the other on "Notions of Correctness" by Jeremy Warburg.

Robins, R. H. *Ancient and Medieval Grammatical Theory in Europe* with particular reference to modern linguistic doctrines. London: Bell (G.) & Sons Ltd., 1952.

Despite the apparent remoteness of its title, this short book is extremely helpful in clarifying our understanding of the false orientation of most current school grammars, and in explaining how this false orientation came about.

——. *General Linguistics: an Introductory Survey,* London: Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., 1964.

An admirably lucid and comprehensive introduction to the scientific study of language. Illustrative material drawn mainly (but not exclusively) from English. Not easy reading, but never unnecessarily difficult.

Strang, Barbara. *Modern English Structure.* London: Edward Arnold Ltd., and Baltimore, Md.: Williams and Wilkins Co., 1963.

An introductory textbook intended primarily for university students. Though perhaps a little conservative in approach, it

does provide a descriptive analysis of the structure of Modern English which is reasonably intelligible yet at the same time acceptable from the point of view of the linguistic scientist.

Sweet, H. *A New English Grammar*. Part I, *Introduction, Phonology and Accidence,* 1891; Part II, *Syntax,* 1898. Reissued; New York: Oxford University Press.

Despite its date of publication, this grammar by the father of "modern linguistics" was so far in advance of its time that its approach and materials are still of living interest today.

Reading and the Foundations of English

Cutforth, J. *English in the Primary School.* Oxford: Blackwell (Basil) & Mott Ltd., 1952.

A useful descriptive account of the approach to English in British junior schools (age 7-11). Sound enough in general attitudes, though not perhaps reaching very far below the surface.

Goddard, N. L. *Reading in the Modern Infants' School.* London: University of London Press, 1958.

A valuable descriptive account of good modern practice.

Morris, Ronald. *Success and Failure in Learning to Read.* London: Oldbourne Press Ltd., 1963.

A thoughtful, discursive consideration of a number of current problems in the teaching of reading, which ranges widely over ages, stages, and ability levels, applying urbane good sense to a number of diverse issues.

Children's Books and Authors

Fisher, Margery. *Intent Upon Reading: A Critical Appraisal of Modern Fiction for Children.* Leicester: Brockhampton Press Ltd., 1961.

A wide-ranging and useful survey of books and authors.

Lines, Kathleen M. *Four to Fourteen: A Library of Books for Children.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1956.

A useful anotated list, with suggested age-gradings.

Pickard, P. M. *I Could a Tale Unfold.* London: Tavistock Publications Ltd., 1961.

A stimulating if somewhat uneven discussion of the psychological significance for children of the stories they hear, read, or watch; special attention is paid to the question of "violence" in children's books and comics.

The Teaching of Written English

Clegg, A. B., ed. *The Excitement of Writing.* London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1964.

An attractive collection of children's writing gathered together

from primary and secondary schools in the West Riding of Yorkshire, together with some description of the school conditions which gave rise to it; also swingeing attacks upon "English exercises" and the influence of external examinations.

Gurrey, P. *The Teaching of Written English.* London: Longmans, Green & Co. Ltd., 1954.

A searching and illuminating analysis of the principles involved in teaching children to write. Not easy reading, but well worth persevering with.

Hourd, Marjorie L., and Gertrude E. Cooper. *Coming into Their Own: A Study of the Idiom of Young Children Revealed in Their Verse-Writing.* London: Heinemann Group of Publishers Ltd., 1959.

An anthology of poems by a single class of children, aged 9-10. The extended commentary, often penetrating, discusses a number of important educational issues and demonstrates the relevance, for the classroom teacher, of both literary-critical and psychological insight.

Spoken English

Wilkinson, Andrew. *Spoken English.* Educational Review Occasional Publication No. 2. Birmingham: University Education Department, 1965.

A stimulating exposition of the concept of "oracy" in which the author attacks the neglect of the spoken language in English schools, outlines the contributions to be made in this area by linguistic science, and proceeds to a careful analysis of the problems of testing.

Drama

Burton, E. J. *Drama in Schools: Approaches, Methods and Activities.* London: Herbert Jenkins, 1955.

An intelligent and informed discussion of the place of drama at different levels in education. Many excellent practical suggestions.

Garrard, Alan, and John Wiles. *Leap to Life—An Experiment in Youth Drama.* London: Chatto & Windus Ltd., 1957, 1965.

A stimulating account of one particular approach to dramatic activity in secondary schools and youth clubs: a form of improvisation based on movement and mime to music.

Joseph, Bertram. *Acting Shakespeare.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul Ltd., 1960.

This extended discussion of the main problems which arise in acting Shakespeare today is at the same time scholarly and rooted in the practical experience of production and teaching. It stresses, with much telling example, the importance for

the actor of an awareness of the rhetorical and poetic organization of Shakespeare's words. Not, for the most part, directly applicable to classroom acting and school production, but highly relevant to it.

Slade, Peter. *An Introduction to Child Drama.* London: University of London Press, 1958.
A shortened version of Peter Slade's longer book *Child Drama* which contains most of the author's valuable insights in more easily assimilable form. Good, both theoretically and practically, on the value of creative dramatic activity to children's development; covers ages 5-15.

Teaching Backward Children

Holbrook, David. *English for the Rejected.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1964.
A vivid and perceptive account of work with a C-stream in a rural secondary modern school, based mainly on an analysis of their imaginative writing. General attitudes wholly commendable; the occasional rhetorical exaggeration should not be allowed to obscure the important insights which lie behind.

Taylor, Elizabeth A. *Experiments with a Backward Class.* London: Methuen & Co. Ltd., 1946.
An absorbing and detailed account of a year's work in which personal writing and the making of a play occupied a key role.

Vernon, M. D. *Backwardness in Reading.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1957.
A perceptive and well-balanced survey of the relevant research.

English in the Life of the School as a Whole

Blishen, Edward. *Roaring Boys.* London: Thames and Hudson Ltd., 1955.
A semifictionalized account of teaching in a tough secondary modern boys' school in North London; written with sensitivity and penetration.

Mackenzie, R. F. *A Question of Living.* London: Collins (William), Sons & Co. Ltd., 1963.
A headmaster's account of pioneering work carried out at a Junior Secondary School in a Scottish mining town. Vivid and challenging.

Marshall, Sybil. *An Experiment in Education.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1963.
A delightful account of work in a one-teacher village school with the emphasis on creativity in art and in writing.

Periodicals

Growing Point. Northampton, England.
Published nine times a year by editor Margery Fisher, Ashton Manor, Northampton.
Reviews new books for children, and some older ones.

The Junior Bookshelf. Huddersfield, England.
A review of children's books published six times a year, from Marsh Hall, Thurstonland, Huddersfield.

NATE Bulletin. Berks, England: NATE.
Ed. Andrew Wilkinson. Published three times a year by National Association for the Teaching of English, 197 Henley Road, Caversham, Berks.

The Use of English. London, England: Chatto & Windus Ltd.
Ed. Denys Thompson. A quarterly.

References on the Teaching of English in Canada

Compiled by Philip G. Penner,
University of British Columbia

Association of Canadian University Teachers of English, Report #1, 1958.
Though abbreviated and incomplete, this Report contains valuable information about the range of interests of ACUTE. Twelve separate papers and two symposia are reported in summary.

Baker, Harold Stewart. *The High School English Teacher: Concepts of Professional Responsibility and Role.* Toronto: Ryerson, 1949.
This research study examines the professional responsibilities of English teachers, and indicates the reactions of practicing teachers of English to these responsibilities in terms of approval, practice and educational preparation.

Carpenter, Edmund Snow, and Marshall McLuhan, eds. *Explorations in Communications: An Anthology.* Boston: Beacon Press, 1960.
An anthology of essays that appeared between 1953 and 1959 in the University of Toronto's journal *Explorations.* This journal explored the grammars of such languages as print, the newspaper format, and television, attempting to examine objectively the current electronic revolution by seeing one medium from the perspective of others. The essays, by anthropologists, psychologists, literary critics, sociologists, philosophers, artists, and poets, are particularly concerned with the effects of the newer technologies of communication upon education.

Deverell, A. Frederick. *Canadian Bibliography of Reading and Literature Instruction* (English) 1760 to 1959. Vancouver: Copp Clark Co. (c. 1963).
An inclusive bibliography of contributions made by Canadian teachers and philosophers to the body of knowledge about the teaching of Reading and Literature. The bibliography contains a valuable section on Canadian books for children and youth. A more extensive list of Canadian authors can be found

in Dr. R. E. Watters' *A Checklist of Canadian Literature, 1628-1950* (University of Toronto Press).

Frye, Northrop. *Anatomy of Criticism: Four Essays.* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1957.

An influential book; attempts to give a systematic and comprehensive view of the scope, theory, principles, and techniques of literary criticism. The four essays are on historical, ethical, archetypal, and rhetorical criticism.

——. *The Educated Imagination.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1964.

Literature is valuable because it educates the imagination, where we live all day and make decisions. Frye gives special attention to the psychology of myth, especially to the story of losing and regaining identity.

——. *Sound and Poetry.* New York: Columbia University Press, 1957.

An excellent survey of metrical styles in poetry. Contains an interesting section on changes in metrical style in the fifteenth century, and on music and poetry.

——. *The Well-Tempered Critic.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1963.

A short book, trying to establish some basic principles of literary criticism, and thus of literary education. Especially valuable is the discussion of the rhythms of ordinary speech, prose, and poetry.

——, ed. Three Lectures: *University of Toronto Installation Lectures* (By Frye, Kluckhohn, and Wigglesworth). Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.

Frye's essay, one of three papers presented by teachers in the Humanities, the Social Sciences, and the Natural Sciences, is an arugment that articulateness is the basis of a genuine vision of human life; an eloquent plea for the teaching of responsible and precise use of language.

Joint Committee of the Board of Education and the University of Toronto. *Design for Learning: Reports,* ed. with an introd. by Northrop Frye. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

An important report, the result of a study of school curriculum undertaken by elementary, secondary, and university teachers. The Introduction by N. Frye, the English Report, and an essay "On Rhetoric" by D. F. Theall are valuable.

McLuhan, Marshall. "The ABCED-Minded," *Explorations,* V. 12-18.

An appeal to teachers to see that their students' world is no longer print-bound.

——. "The Electronic Age," *Mass Media in Canada,* ed. John A. Irvins. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962, pp. 177-205.

One of ten essays in this Canadian pioneer study of the nature and function of mass media and the effects on human nature of the interpenetrations of electronic and typographical cultures.

——. *The Gutenberg Galaxy: The Making of Typographic Man.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

A provocative and often provoking study of the effects of the printing press upon the thinking and "world view" of man. The first of the important series of books on a theory of communications media that the French now call *mcLuhanisme.*

——. "The Humanities in the Electronic Age," *Thought from the Learned Society of Canada,* 1961, pp. 3-14.

In the Electronic age the primary task of the Humanities is to understand many new languages born of new knowledge and to keep communication clear and lively. In the past we had "seven centers without margins" (trivium and quadrivium); today we may have as many as seventy.

——. *Understanding Media: The Extensions of Man.* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1964.

Though egocentric in style and dogmatic in tone, undoubtedly an important book; an attempt to understand the revolution in communication technology, and to develop new critical tools. The new technology has extended man so as to abolish space and time.

Macnair, Dorothy Livesay. "Rhythm and Sound in Contemporary Canadian Poetry." M. Ed. Thesis, University of British Columbia, 1965.

A sensitive linguistic analysis of the work of recent Canadian poets, ending with a plea for an oral approach to poetry study in schools.